

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Archives of Current Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Original Manuscript_ACRI_117643 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Food security in India: Milestones achieved so far |
| 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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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> | <p>The discussion could benefit from a more detailed exploration of the socio-economic factors influencing food security.</p> <p>The article mentions various government programs but does not critically evaluate their effectiveness or suggest concrete policy improvements.</p> <p>A more robust policy analysis section would enhance the practical relevance of the study.</p> <p>The methods section needs more detail on how data was collected and analyzed. For example, how were the growth rates calculated, and what statistical tools were used?</p> <p>Including a discussion on the limitations of the data and methods would provide a more balanced view.</p> <p>The methods section needs more detail on how data was collected and analyzed. For example, how were the growth rates calculated, and what statistical tools were used?</p> <p>Including a discussion on the limitations of the data and methods would provide a more balanced view.</p> <p>The methods section needs more detail on how data was collected and analyzed. For example, how were the growth rates calculated, and what statistical tools were used?</p> <p>Including a discussion on the limitations of the data and methods would provide a more balanced view.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Publishable Quality:</p> <p>The manuscript is well on its way to being publishable in an academic journal, given its comprehensive scope, relevance, and clear structure. However, to enhance its quality, the authors should address the detailed weaknesses mentioned above.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendations for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance the depth of analysis and discussion on specific issues and policy implications. Provide a more detailed methodology section, including limitations. Improve the clarity and readability of the text. Ensure graphical data is fully integrated and interpreted in the text. <p>Conduct a more comprehensive literature review and ensure consistent citation.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Optional/General comments | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|

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: | Mahmut Dirik |
| Department, University & Country | Sirnak University, Türkiye |