

Paper: **“Popular Food Products Among Farmers in the Piedmont Triad Region of North Carolina”**

Submitted: 06 April 2024

Accepted: 14 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Uchenna Okefi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p61](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p61)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Innocent Maduekwe
University of Abuja, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Pranvera Troka
Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Fjona Zeneli
University of Milano, Italy

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes but with modification

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Editing required

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

some missing

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good thinking

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, partially.

I suggest that the title should hint at the methodology: explorative analysis, empirical one, etc.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, partially!

The background is worth mentioning, a phrase about the methodology also. More emphasis on the most important results and their value for the market agents and policymakers.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The level of English and the style were fine.

No errors or typos were detected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I do not share the same opinion!

The methodology part misses a clear explanation about the structure of the questionnaire, the types of scales used to collect the data (if there were any!), the data collection time, and the questionnaire's pre-test phase. Moreover, how the data were elaborated, the software, and the techniques are missing.

At this point, a doubt of mine: Is there any official data about the local food in the chosen region? I believe yes (local government reports or central ones related to agriculture), I'm supposing they are formalized food producers, registered at the Tax office that can offer more reliable information.

I do not see the advantage of using primary data in this case, since there is self-reporting data! And the sample, is it a representative one?

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusions are concise, and related to the results of the work.
It misses some discussion and policy implications in terms of sustainability, sustainable diets (since we are talking about locally produced food), and the environmental effect.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic, even limited in a region is interesting since is related to local food production, seen as a very important issue in terms of sustainability, food security, and sustainable diets (very hot topics nowadays).

I acknowledge the efforts made to collect primary data and analyze it, but I do not see personally the justification behind, not using instead secondary, official data.

Moreover, knowing nothing about the structure of the questionnaire, and its sections, I get to see just a few descriptive graphs illustrating the data and not a well-designed methodology behind. I perceived an exploratory work, nothing more.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear, concise, and adequately represents the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Overall yes, but the aim could be stated differently.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No, the grammar is correct.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes - however, I find the list of references old.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript presents valuable insights into the popular food products among farmers in the Piedmont Triad region of North Carolina. However, few points can be addressed to strengthen the manuscript and contribute to the understanding of local food systems and agricultural practices, as below:

- It would be beneficial to explicitly state the research questions.
- Consider providing additional details on the survey instrument's design and validation to enhance transparency and ensure the reliability of the data collected.
- Discuss Potential Limitations (such as relatively low response rate).
- Provide additional context or interpretation for these findings and expand discussions.
- Incorporate Recent Citations.
