

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_122857
Title of the Manuscript:	LIVING HEDGES AND HOUSEHOLD FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY IN COTE D'IVOIRE
Type of the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 important for scientific community and it is about case study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. But some correction is needed as suggested in the comment. Some data may be included in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sub section and structure are appropriate.	
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 manuscript is scientifically correct and is technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but some more recent references may be added. Mention all references which were used as review in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English quality is o.k.	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript may be published with minor corrections.	

Review Form 3

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:	Sunil Kumar
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India