



Paper: **“Eating Patterns and Adherence to the Mediterranean Diet: A Cross-Sectional Study in Albania”**

Corresponding Author: Kristela Jaupaj

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p11

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Ma'moun Habiballah, Al-Hussein Bin Talal University/Jordan

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/4/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/4/2020
Manuscript Title: Eating patterns and adherence to the Mediterranean diet: a cross-sectional study in Albania.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.4.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study aimed (as mentioned in its objective) to evaluate healthy & non-healthy patterns of eating; However, there is nothing indicates this aim in the study's title.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There were two objectives for the study ((1) evaluation of healthy & non-healthy patterns of eating; (2) evaluation of the adherence to the Mediterranean diet); the connection between these objectives was not clear. 2. More need to be mentioned about the population of the study; were they households, students or what? 	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>There are many structure and improper wording problems. There is a need for a critical reading; examples of lines to be amended & improved include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 11: religious and economic or you can use and/or. - Lines 12—15: the sentence is too long it can be divided into 2 sentences. - Lines 16-20 sentences are connected improperly: it will be better to replace the semicolons with commas. - Lines 25-27 examples of chronic diseases should be between 2 brackets. - Lines 27-28 citations should be in a succession manner from the oldest to the newest one. - Line 35: citation mistake. - Line 36: no need to use underline. - Line 41: structure problem & improper wording example it is better to make the sentence as "however, in spite all beneficial effects of the Mediterranean diet, ..". - Line 42: particularly among younger (correction). - Line 44: over the (space). - Lines 41 (page 1) – line 2 (page 2): the whole argument was not presented properly. - Page 2 line 10: the title should be study's population and sample. - Page 2 line 11: instead of "we conducted" it is better to be "a cross-sectional survey was conducted". 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How sample size was determined & what was the response rate ? - What are the procedures to ensure validity? (for example was there a pilot test?) - Was not there any test of reliability ! - What are the hypotheses of the study? <p><i>ease insert your comments)</i></p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain	3

errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More is needed to be mentioned about the background of the study; for example more is needed to be mentioned about what is the PREDIMED study. - In result section: there was only one subsection of sample characteristics, I suggest to include a subsection for each group of statistical analyses, with a specified title indicating the content of the subsection. 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There was not any comparison with the findings of previous studies (the authors mentioned that there was no study in Albania that investigated the same variables. However, the researchers can compare with similar studies in other countries or of other pattern for different diets).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There were fine except some citation problems mentioned in section No. 3 of this reviewing form	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: