

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
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

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.	I suppose that this is a paper in which the authors provide a comprehensive summary of the history, current situation, and future developments of agricultural machinery, agricultural informatics, agricultural management, and other fields. I found the content very interesting. However, the authors should have added more figures and tables, in addition to just the text, to make the paper more visually clearer. We reviewers urge the authors to make such revisions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	To some extent.	
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 of the article is comprehensive. I suggest the authors should have added more figures and tables, in addition to just the text, to make the paper more visually clearer.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To some extent.	
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 robust; however, this is not technically sound. However, the authors should have added more figures and tables, in addition to just the text, to make the paper more visually clearer. We reviewers urge the authors to make such revisions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient; however, these are not so recent. That's why we reviewers ask the authors to revise the article to include more recent (2020-2024) literature.	
Minor REVISION comments	Acceptable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Nothing specific.	

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:	Shinji Kawakura
Department, University & Country	Kobe University, Japan