

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96183
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Food Insecurity among Rural Farming Households: Evidence from Ikere Local Government Area of Ekiti State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the issue of food security is an important topic for scientific community, especially given climate changes and current situation at the global markets. Yes, it is suitable. Yes, the abstract represents the study very well. Yes, they are appropriate. Yes, I think it is correct. However, the information on the period of data collection is missing. I would also add an information on the studies limitations to boost the papers scientific correctness. Yes, the references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is correct.	
Optional/General comments	Yes mentioned in answer 5.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barbara Wieliczko
Department, University & Country	Institute for Rural and Agricultural Development, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland