

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_112136
Title of the Manuscript:	FROM CAFETERIA TO CLASSROOM: UNRAVELING THE NEXUS OF SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS AND FOOD SECURITY AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN BANGLADESH
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes this is important for the scientific community because, it highlights some important points. It firstly investigated the food security of students at public universities in Bangladesh using Household Dietary Diversity. The results reveal that 71.32% of students are food secure, while 28.68% experience food insecurity. Secondly, it pointed out the relationship between variables using regression. This showed that gender, income levels, and the father's occupation positively were affecting food security, while residential status had a negative impact. It thereby concluded that food insecurity was further exacerbated by the limited availability of affordable food. 2. Yes, this title is really suit for this article. 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriately done. But it could be great to add a representative map to at least show the country's location in ASIA in the methodology section. 5. This research is scientifically correct because it pointed out previous studies and addressed one of the gaps to be filled. 6. The references are sufficient enough but they could be represented as follows instead of putting them within the text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within the text: Text¹ Text² - the references will look like: [1] Hiller, M. B., Winham, D. M. [2] Jaron, D., & Galal, O. (2009) <p>This will make the text more suit to read.</p> 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The communication is good but there are some few points to reviewed → Look comments into the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Look comments into the document.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Makan Garba Diarisso
Department, University & Country	Institut de formation Sony Aly Ber, Mali