

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_115404</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FREQUENCY OF FOOD PURCHASE OF FAMILIES IN THREE DISTRICTS OF ANDHRA PRADESH IN THREE TIME PERIODS OF COVID – 19 PANDEMIC (BEFORE, DURING COVID – 19 PANDEMIC AND IN PRESENT SITUATION)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Paper</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Given that the study is replicated in three districts of Andhra Pradesh in a unique fashion, this study is relevant to the scientific community, given the global food crisis being experienced.</b></p> <p><b>No. I suggest "COVID-19 pandemic and food demand in three districts of Andhra Pradesh of India"</b></p> <p><b>The abstract is not well written. It should follow the conventional APA style of a single block, with a maximum of 250 words.</b></p> <p><b>Not quite. They need to be restructured.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>The references need to be updated to reflect the current reality</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, but requires grammatical finetuning.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Reviewer's Comments</b></p> <p>Generally, the article is well written, and the novelty of the subject matter is clearly observed. However, I wish to make the following suggestions/observations in order to strengthen the quality of the work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Abstract:</b> The abstract of the study does not conform with the standard format of a single block paragraph, not more than 250 words. It is too voluminous. It should also not be sectionalized. Moreover, it is presented as if it were data presentation and analysis section. Remove the figures in your abstract too.</li> <li>2. <b>Title:</b> The title of this paper appears to reveal only one variable (frequency of food purchase of families). Where then is the dependent and the independent variable in the study? Besides, it appears to be too lengthy. For instance, it may be reframed as "Frequency of .....Andhra Pradesh before, during and after COVID-19 pandemic", in order to avoid tautology.</li> <li>3. <b>Introduction:</b> The citation style should conform with APA in-text referencing format. List the authors' names instead of numbering them, as may be the case with the MLA style. The author should clearly state the motivation behind this study, as well as the contribution to knowledge.</li> <li>4. <b>Methodology:</b> The title should rather read, "methodology of the study". Briefly explain what you mean by the Ex Post facto research design. How relevant is it to this research? How was data collected for this study? How did the author arrive at the population of the study? The author needs to come out clearly to indicate the detailed processes used to collect</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>data, and the nature of sample distribution, and the justification for selecting the three districts. For instance, what is so important about them that warranted a study on them? These should be done in order to avoid statistical biasness. The table should carry title and source. This will strengthen the methodology and make it more robust.</p> <p><b>5. Results and Discussions:</b> The socio-economic characteristics of respondents need to be captured here, before proceeding for any further analysis. The first table here appears to be too lengthy and borgous. Replicate column titles on each page, given that it has spilled over into the next pages. Paragraphing style should be improved upon. Use block or indented style and be consistent. Here, in-text citation is presented using names of authors, while in the other sections, it was done with numbering. Strictly stick to the former style please. Comparison/contrast should be clearly done by stating whether the current finding corroborates or disagree with previous ones.</p> <p><b>6. Conclusion:</b> With a sentence, reiterate the purpose and motivation behind the study. Recommendation is conspicuously absent in the conclusion section.</p> <p><b>7. References:</b> References here do not seem to follow the APA style. E.g. No. 21 is all in upper cases. Do a thorough check of all the references to ensure that all the in-text citations are properly reported in the reference list.</p> <p>The author should do thorough grammar check. If possible, professional grammar check should be done. There is no theoretical framework and empirical review. Theories support scientific investigations. Without empirical review, it may be difficult to obtain a convincing gap for the study. There should therefore be theoretical and empirical review of related works.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**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:	Solomon Gbaka
Department, University & Country	Benue State University, Nigeria