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

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.	Your paper touches a very important line of work. As School Feeding Programme are used more in the regions where poverty and hunger are barriers to human capital development. This study is interesting and unique in terms of linking school feeding program with development of rural agricultural economy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title of your study is ambiguous and confusing. As the study is an attempt to analyse the role of school feeding programme in smallholder farmer empowerment and rural development, so you may choose one of the following title for your study: 1) Impact of School Feeding Programme on the Livelihood of Smallholder Farmers and Rural Economic Development 2) School Feeding Programme: A Catalyst for Empowering Smallholder Farmers and Rural Economic Development	
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 study is clear and concise. However, last lines of the abstract contain grammatical mistakes, which should be corrected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The study follows the standard scientific exposition, i.e introduction, literature review and methodology are presented in the correct order and convey adequate information. however there some weakness in flow of arguments and paragraph linkages, and oftentimes, it appears that spaces are missing between words.	
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.	The study has theoretical in its nature; the empirical model presented is not backed by conceptual framework. Similarly, the author has not established a clear theoretical path between school feeding programme between school enrolment, nutritional and health status of targeted children. Further, theories are not explicitly presented in order to justify linkage between school feeding programme and rural economic development. Thus, revisions are suggested to improve robustness of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Yes, the references of the study are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	While the scholarly communication is appropriate, there are several typographical erros and grammatically incorrect sentences. Additionally, there are instances where spaces between words are missing. The author is suggested to carefully review and revise the language of the study to improve its clarity and overall readability.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Rahat Sher Khan**
Department, University & Country	**Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Technical Education and Vocational Training Authority, Pakistan And University of Peshawar, Pakistan**