

Manuscript: “**Factors Influencing The Food Security And Nutrition Expenditures In Farm Households In Punjab, Pakistan**”

Submitted: 28 July 2020

Accepted: 24 May 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Asima Ihsan

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Ma'moun Ahmad Habiballah, Al Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.08.20
Manuscript Title: Factors Influencing the Food Security and Nutrition Intake in farm households in Punjab, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36.08.2	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>“Food Security” term seems to have wider meaning that content in the manuscript- consider 'Affordability'</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Title: Factors Influencing the Food Security and Nutrition Intake in farm households in Punjab, Pakistan
nr. 36.08.20

In the manuscript described analysis of food consumption and socio-economic factors for over 700 farming households. Although some results may be discussable, the study allowed to express very important conclusions e.g of significance of education level of farmers and poverty on farming crop diversification and food consumption pattern. The manuscript contains important messages and is worth to publish.

Notes:

Authors did not included food wastage factor which may interact with some variables, (e.g. family poverty, consumption expenditures,), what may weaken some relationships. At least comment of that is necessary.

Number of obs. e.g. "745.0000" in tables should be simplified to integer

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 20/8/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/9/2020
Manuscript Title: Factors Influencing the Food Security and Nutrition Intake in farm households in Punjab, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0836/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The study's title doesn't imply its objectives. To be more specific you can change "nutrition intakes" to nutrition expenditures.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract is long & need to be reduced. Think of the first 7 lines of it (7-14) & try to reduce them into one sentence. - The second objective is the main objective which consist with the study's 	

<p>title; while the first one cannot be considered as a separate objective for this study, its achievement is a part supporting the key objective of the study (the 2nd objective).</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The study need a critical/proof reading, examples of mistakes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 16; the data was collected- while it should be the data were collected. - Line 17: again "the data was used"- data is a plural noun. - Line 19: "the study has used"- rethink of the verb tense. - Long sentences, for example the first sentence in the introduction (lines 35-37); another example: lines 61-65. - When using abbreviations for the first time, they need to be identified (example SBP in line 44). - The word "firstly" in line 57 is bold for no reason (as I mentioned before a critical reading is needed). - Line 65: "further" I guess you mean "furthermore". - Line 192: "in line" >> "in line with". 	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Data sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 129: I don't think that the study depended only on primary source of data!! (nothing is mentioned about secondary resources of data) - It is better to move the section of "Data sources" as a subsection within the methodology section. <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This section need to be merged properly with the previous one. - The explanation of study's variables is not clear. - What was the theoretical base of selecting study's dimensions, are they used for the first time? If no, who used them before? - I suggest to make one table that distinguish between dependent variables and the independent ones. 	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>2</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some parts need to be rearranged, for example, the data sources & the methodology parts should be merged. 2. In the introduction section: there was no discussion of previous studies!! What was the research gap? & how did your research worked to gill in that gap? 3. I prefer if there was a description for the study's model & hypotheses. 4. The implication section need to be rarranged to cover wider range of 	

implications than just the policies related ones.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<p>Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conclusions must be written with more confidence & without any recommendations. The proper place for recommendations is the implication section. (for example, look to the 2nd paragraph). - The last paragraph needs to be rewritten in a clearer manner. In other words, the elasticity of food consumption needs to be presented according to all factors or it can be highlighted generally without talking about some factors & ignoring the others. <p>Policy implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why policy implications? Are these implications only targeting policy development and their makers? - In the first point, the author needs to determine who is targeted by the recommendation. 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some references are quite old ones & must be replaced with an updated ones as possible; examples include references number 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 19, 26, 37, 38, 40, 47 & 51. - Reference 15 must be rewritten correctly with the date of publication & the publisher & the place of publishing. - References 21, 35 need to be rewritten correctly. 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Return for major revision and resubmission	
---	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Besides the previously mentioned comments in this evaluation form, I advise you to look through the following:

Introduction

- Lines 103-104: the meaning in the last part of this sentence is not completed; also the citation has no date (a year).
- Lines 119-120: " The study also aims to suggest and implement some additional strategies for healthy farming community"- how does your research implement strategies!!!?. Secondly, to suggest implications is a default aim for all studies; this is a part of their added value.

Results & discussion:

- There was no significant relationship found between education & family poverty; why? What is the researchers' justification?.

- In the section of elasticity of consumption for some kinds of food according to many factors, results were shown without any trial of justification!!