

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_126056
Title of the Manuscript:	Tackling Peri-Urban Food Insecurity Through Modern Agriculture
Type of the Article	Original 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

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 is relevant to the scientific community as it brings on board topical issues on technological advancement in the agricultural sector with a specific focus on hydroponics. This is of great importance as it also provides better options for peri-urban settlers who have land as a scarce resource. In addition the technology also reduces time allocated for crop management and maintenance and creates employment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable, however the write up only focusses on hydroponics. It might be more convenient to substitute modern technology with "Hydroponics" Tackling Peri-Urban Food Insecurity Through Modern Agriculture - Hydroponics	
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 comprehensive, however there are a few recommendations: There is no information on the sample size, methodology, tools used, number of project participants and the analysis carried out to come to conclusions drawn. There has been a repetitive use of subjective words which needs statistical evidence to support the claims.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very appropriate. There may be a need to add a section on the economics of hydroponics. This section will give a clear picture on the costs of setting up, the suitable crops, the materials required, maintenance and even the suppliers of the systems. This can als be used to identify gaps and make it more relevant for other countries to adopt and pilot the technology.	
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 script is scientifically robust as it brings a topic on board which unveils a potential technology to explore towards enhancing food security. Pictures shared gives and clearer picture of the technology and evidence that research has been done. Also referencing has been done for a significant number of sources, that is thirty references to the work submitted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English is scholarly.	
Optional/General comments	More information should be availed on the methodology used to collect information, challenges and the statistical analytics.	

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:	Kundai Noah Koreka
Department, University & Country	Bindura University of Science Education, Zimbabwe