



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_11976
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Locus of Control on Eating Practices and Nutrition Awareness among Young Adolescent Sportspersons in Kerala
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community as the research findings presented provide opportunity to scientifically determine and explain the role of this important personal trait on eating practices and nutrition awareness among young adolescent sportspersons in Kerala. It is important to recall that many adolescents for various reasons have eating disorders which in turn may affect their health. Findings can provide basis for nutritional counselling.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable but it can read EFFECTS OF LOCUS OF CONTROL ON EATING PRACTICES AND NUTRITIONAL AWARENESS AMONG YOUNG SPORTSPERSONS IN KERALA, INDIA.</p> <p>3. Not quite. It could also include objectives of the study and theoretical framework, if any. Methodology might also include research design, sampling techniques, the other data collection instrument(s) as well as how reliability and validity were ensured. Summary of findings can be given without the figures. Recommendations can come after findings.</p>	



<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>4. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some improvement is needed in its structure. For instance: The introduction should start with a strong catchy statement to set a positive tone for the entire document.</p> <p>In addition, each paragraph should contain one distinct idea.</p> <p>Statement of the problem has also not come out clearly in the introduction.</p> <p>Methodology section could explicitly explain research design, area of study, sampling procedures, data collection tools and procedures as well data analysis(description of how data was collected and analysed) under distinct subheadings. As it is, much of the material in 2.2 makes it look like literature review.</p> <p>In the results and discussion section, one table should present only one type of data. The researcher can indicate the source of information presented in each table at the bottom of each respective table on the left. Information contained in each table should be interpreted immediately after the respective table and meaning given before moving on to create another table. Thus Table1 could be broken into six tables and table 2 into five tables, with table containing data on sports specialization being one continuous one.</p> <p>Should findings under Table 2 talk about young athletes or sportspersons?</p> <p>Moreover, how does sleep come in? How is it related to the variables being investigated?</p>	
---	--	--



<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>5. Yes, though most findings are neither sufficiently interpreted nor are they contextualized.</p> <p>6. The references are too few and some are too old with the exception of Rotter(1966). The researcher can get more materials on the internet.</p> <p><u>Additional comments</u> The researcher does not seem to have read a lot of literature to establish what other researches have established in relation to this study. Similarly, findings of the current study have not been compared / contrasted with those of related studies to support these results and to determine how and ways in which this study differs from other studies on the same topic.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but be sure to write in third party throughout. 'our' and 'we' appear after Tab 7.</p>	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>	<p>N/A</p>	



J. K. Press

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Linah Anyango Ochieng
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya