

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127997
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing Food Security Scales: Evidence and Methods in The FAO Context
Type of the Article	Review

### 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a review of FAO's tools for measuring food security, including the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), the Global Food Security Index (GFSI), and the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC). The systematic approach, analysis, and emphasis on strengths and recommendations for improvement can make this paper very relevant to policymakers, researchers, and organizations addressing food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	This section is too long. About half of the initial word count will be fine. Take out too much details.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Partially, there is a need for more information. The Introduction section is overly broad. It should concisely set up the context and focus on the FAO tools discussed. The Review of Literature lacks clear subsections or thematic organization. Grouping related tools and concepts would improve readability. The methodology section lacks depth about the inclusion/exclusion criteria for studies reviewed and how these criteria were applied. There is no justification for the selection of the 2000-2023 period or for the focus on specific FAO tools. The Results and Discussion section should integrate tables and figures more fluidly into the text. References to figures (e.g., Figure 2) should be specific, with critical analysis directly linked to them. Include the sources for all your figures and tables. While the manuscript lists figures and tables, there is insufficient interpretation of the trends they depict. For example, what do increases in severe food insecurity signify for policy or intervention strategies? Calculations (e.g., prevalence rates in India) are included but need clearer contextual explanation and connection to the review's conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are incomplete or poorly cited. For instance, "Ballard, Kepple, & Cafiero, 2013" should include full bibliographic details. The manuscript frequently mentions the FAO report (2023) but does not provide full details for cross-checking.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is need for proper language editing. Numerous grammatical errors reduced the readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is need for restructuring of statements and better paragraphing. Also, some statements were awkward as they were ai generated. All my comments per sections are highlighted in the document for the authors to work with.	

### 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:	Bright Oluwatomilola Olunusi
Department, University & Country	Cornell University, USA