

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_121628
Title of the Manuscript:	Agroecology Principles, Practices, and Their Impact on Sustainable Food Systemss
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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Because of the gross errors in scientific writing, I cannot see any added value for the scientific community in the manuscript. No sources/citations are provided in the text. Except for very few exemptions, sources are more than 10-15 years old, despite the authors' claim to "synthesize current knowledge on agroecology". The aim of the article are not specific enough. Especially the aim "to contribute to the broader discourse on sustainable agriculture and to encourage the adoption of agroecological practices worldwide" seems exaggerated. This leads to a superficial treatment of the manuscript's topic.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The author(s) mainly list several unsubstantiated claims and that are do not show any connection. Paragraphs are made in a random fashion and do not support a better text comprehension. Furthermore,, there as a lack of paragraphs, which would provide some structure for the reader. In the context of the whole paper, this leaves the impression that the authors have a lack of expertise on the topic because of which they were unable to structure the manuscript into meaningful paragraphs. A few practical examples for the statements made would also show that the authors have some expertise in the field. However, as they can only be found in a table at the end of the manuscript and are not connected to the text the impression that the authors did not really grasp what they were writing about remains. The origins of the examples in the table are unclear.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is neither robust nor sound. There are no sources given in the text and the sources allegedly used according to the bibliography are too old. The methodology of the review is unclear. Do the authors present a systematic review or present an academic discourse by citing the most important contributions? The claims made about agroecology are not questioned and there is no discussion of counter arguments. Instead of reviewing the literature the authors simply repeat findings and claims that were probably made in the literature read for the manuscript. A review would at least present an assessment, if the reviewed literature presents some conflicting perspectives or comment/question why all literature surprisingly presents the same findings and conclusions. Suddenly in the subchapter "Research and Innovation" the authors speak of emerging challenges faced by agroecology, these challenges are mentioned at no earlier point of the paper where agroecology is presented at the panacea for all our agriculture and food problems</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No, that is one of the major reasons why I reject the paper. For elaborations see above.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	I would recommend the authors to see this manuscript as a first own sheet of notes. Use it to narrow down your focus and also look for more recent literature. Regarding the review you should be able to identify: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How the discourse developed through time.2. What are conflicts/agreements in different sources.3. What is the most important literature.	

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:	Mirka Erler
Department, University & Country	University of Vechta, Germany