

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_110619
Title of the Manuscript:	FOOD SECURITY IN HOUSEHOLDS OF STUNTING TODDLERS IN THE MERATUS MOUNTAINS REGION HULU SUNGAI TENGAH DISTRICT, SOUTH KALIMANTAN PROVINCE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write 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>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, in particular those who deal with food security, agriculture, environment, public health etc. This research is important but total sample or respondent (20) is too small. Moreover, sampling that conducted only in one sub-district was not proportionally spread in research area (Meratus Mountain Region).</p> <p>2. The title is suitable, but check the grammar.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. It is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient (only 14) and not recent enough. There are 5 out of 14 (35.71%) recent publications (published in the last five years). Add some more recent references will improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>1. Be consistent with the administrative terms, Hulu Sungai Tengah is a district (title) or regency (introduction)? Batang Alai Timur is a district or sub-district (Research and Method)?.</p> <p>2. Check Table 2.</p> <p>3. PPH is food consumption pattern or expected food pattern?. Be consistent.</p> <p>4. Table 8 narration. Food alert 10%?</p> <p>5. Conclusions and Recommendations is too long, make it in concise (short and effective sentence).</p> <p>6. References : is No. 8 written correctly ?.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality needs improvement for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>=====</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iman Santosa
Department, University & Country	Indonesia