Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_83065**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Socio-personal Characteristics of Ecological Farmers in terms of Food Security in Nagaland**
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. **Title:** It is impossible to measure effect using this study design. To measure effect, there should be advanced study design. And I suggest you to modify the title. 2. . ……55.83 per cent of the farmers had medium level of food security. The study found that age, education…..Look at this statement and please don't start a sentence using figures. Introduction 3. It is too shallow and not well synthesized and synchronized. 4. The problem is not well stated in terms of severity, risk factors, existing policies, strategies and program interventions. 5. The study is not well justified and should consider what has been done on the topic? What remains to be done or the gap authors identified? And finally which gap will be filled by the study? 6. You have to high light the significance of the study focusing on who are the beneficiaries, what are the benefits and how the benefits can be utilized. Methods 1. To shallow. 1.1. What is the source and study population? 1.2. What about the inclusion and exclusion criteria? 1.3. How maintain the quality of the data? 1.4. What about the data analysis issues? 2. Where is the ethical issues addressed? 3. Why equal number of participants? Do you think the number of farmers are equal in each village? Why not proportional allocation per farmers size/population? 4. How you calculated the sample size? It is not clear. Please put the scientific sample size calculation clearly. Results 1. What is your base for age classification? What is your base for family size categorization? At least it should much with some standards either country level or international standards. 2. 3. When you compare your results with other study findings, please try to consider the context in to account in your discussion. 4. There should be recommendation	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The abstract is too short especially the methods and results part. Please try to make it self explanatory.	

Comment [Z1]: Don't start a sentence using figure and try to use text.

	2. Introduction first line: Better to mention the country name rather than ‘‘the phrase our country”.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is good but it needs some missed and shallow parts. It is only a discrptive study but the title and abstract seems analytical. Be consistent.	

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)* It does not address/write on how he/she addressed the four ethical principles.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Zewdie Aderaw Alemu**
Department, University & Country	**Debre markos University, Ethiopia**