

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122125
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Agricultural Extension in Addressing Food Security: Examining the Contributions of Extension Services to Achieving Food Security Goals
Type of the Article	Review 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Food security and safety are always of real interest for everybody, not only for the academic community. So, in my opinion, this is a manuscript that is going to be read by a large number of people. In the same time, it is well documented and it present a lot of new information.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite original and it expresses the overall idea of the manuscript. No suggestions here.	
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.	I have no suggestions regarding the Abstract. Being a review article, the abstract is free of restrictions, it only needs to attract the reader.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is also not strict, so I suggest to remain in the current form. Please use a free line between subsections, in order to give a nicer aspect.	
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.	From the scientific point of view, all the presented data are correct, but they really need an update, so that the article to provide new and interesting facts. Please insert some paragraphs with up to date findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Enough references as number, but very few of them are from the last five years. Please update the references. Also, not all of them are cited in the manuscript – I identified „Simpson & Owens, 2002”, „Swanson & Samy, 2002” etc., missing. Others, like „Trendov et al., 2019” are incorrect cited – please verify and correct.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No comments here, except the way citations are made, the English language is just suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	As I mentioned, the manuscript is not at all up to date, so it needs to solve this issue. Verify all the cited paper, write them correctly and add some new references.	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Roxana Horoias
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania