

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_126833
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis Of Farmers' Household Food Security Around Pt Jembayan Muara Bara Tenggara Seberang District
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript was well presented and there is clarity of expression	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest the title to be changed to "ANALYSIS OF FARMERS' HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY In the PT JEMBAYAN MUARA BARA TENGGARONG SEBERANG DISTRICT	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract clearly demonstrates the message the author is passing across	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but I suggest the author increase the keywords to 5 words	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I suggest more recent references to be updated	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The author didn't discuss the results as required. I suggest major revision in the discussion section	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fariya Abubakari
Department, University & Country	Murdoch University, Australia