

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_127150
Title of the Manuscript:	Household Food Security assessment in a Protracted Emergency. Case of a rural Community in North West Cameroon
Type of the Article	Short Research 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	This manuscript add the new insights regarding the prevalence and determinants of food insecurity, but it didn't discuss the necessary point and	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title and body of the manuscript is contradictory. The title said case of food security and the body discuss about prevalence and determinants of food insecurity. Rearrange the title carefully	
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 is not well organized, because they write study duration and period separately from methodology. Add study period, design and setting under methodology..	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Please, separate result and discussion . Under methodology how data was entern didn't discussed	
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.	This is not scientifically sound, because of the comments I jot down above.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	It needs grammar corrections	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It needs major corrections	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Gudisa Bereda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopia</b>