Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_124761**
Title of the Manuscript:	**School Feeding Programme, Smallholder Farmers, and Development of Rural Areas in Nigeria**
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

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.	**It touches on issues of Sustainable Development Goals envisioned globally (Poverty Alleviation, No Hunger, and Quality and Equity in Education)**	
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.	**Touch on the methods and methodology, findings and suggestions based on the study in the abstract.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not really. There is no Findings and Discussion section, Implication of the study section, and areas for further research work.	
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.	**It does well by tracing school feeding from of old. The act of linking current issue from seminal literature (empirical) makes the paper very understandable, and scientifically good.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**Both seminal and current** references are present, which makes it good. However, some references are too old. For example, references from 2004.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Minor touches should be done on the grammar.	
Optional/General comments	There is not statement of problem, purpose of the paper, and research objectives in the paper. Kindly make it explicit at the end of the **Introduction**. This makes it a bit difficult to understand the scope and focus of the paper. Under Theoretical Review, kindly use linking words to merge all the theoretical underpinnings of the paper. This will help 'contextualize' the study. Attach dates to names of authors and philosophers under the theoretical review section (in-text and end-of-text citations). Kindly delete the **'among others'** attached to the in-text references under the empirical section. Delete the quotation marks in the empirical review portion. Kindly make a comprehensive brief about your methods and methodology. Talk about research design, study area, population and sample for the study, sampling procedure, data collection tools or techniques, ethical consideration, and analysis of data. There is no Findings and Discussion section, Implication of the study, and areas for further research work. Kindly attach them all as different sections of the study. Thank you.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Asante, George**
Department, University & Country	**University of Cape Coast, Ghana**