

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 56890

Title Enhancing Food Security and Nutrition in Jhumlawang: A Community-Based Agroecology Initiative.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript examines a community-based agroecology initiative in Jhumlawang, Nepal, focusing on its impact on food security and nutrition. The topic is highly relevant, particularly in the context of sustainable agriculture, rural development, and SDG 2 (Zero Hunger). The study combines field data with a strong conceptual foundation in agroecology.

However, despite its importance and promising findings, the manuscript suffers from significant issues in methodological rigor, structure, redundancy, and presentation quality. The paper is currently overly long, repetitive, and unevenly balanced, with excessive literature review sections overshadowing empirical contributions.

Content and Originality

Strengths:

- Addresses a globally relevant issue (food security and agroecology).
- Focus on a specific case study (Jhumlawang) adds contextual value.
- Incorporates community-based and participatory approaches, which are important in agroecology.
- Reports quantifiable improvements:
 - Food-secure months (8 → 10)
 - Malnutrition reduction (25% → 15%)
 - Increased dietary diversity

Concerns:

- The novelty is moderate:
 - Similar agroecology studies exist globally.
- The manuscript does not clearly articulate:
 - What is unique about this case
 - Whether this is a first empirical study of Jhumlawang
- Heavy reliance on descriptive reporting rather than analytical insight

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Literature review includes extensive narrative not directly linked to study objectives

Suggestion:

- Clearly define unique contribution
- Strengthen analytical depth beyond descriptive outcomes

Technical Quality

Strengths:

- Mixed-method approach (quantitative + qualitative) is appropriate.
- Sample size (132 households) is reasonable.
- Use of tools like **SPSS and NVivo** is appropriate.

Minor Concerns:

1. Study Design Issues

- Described as **cross-sectional**, but results imply **before–after comparison**
- No clarity on:
 - Baseline data collection
 - Time frame of intervention

2. Statistical Analysis

- Limited reporting:
 - Only one regression result ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$)
- No:
 - Confidence intervals
 - Model details
 - Control variables
- No test of causality (only association)

3. Measurement Issues

- Food security measured as:
 - “number of food-secure months” → needs justification
- Nutritional outcomes:
 - No clear indicators (e.g., anthropometric methods)

4. Bias and Validity

- No discussion of:
 - Selection bias
 - Recall bias
 - Confounding factors

5. Data Presentation

- Figures are:
 - Poorly labeled
 - Not scientifically formatted
- Some diagrams (loan spiral, leaky bucket) are **conceptual but not explained analytically**

Suggestion:

- Clarify study design (cross-sectional vs longitudinal)
- Provide **robust statistical analysis**
- Define indicators clearly
- Improve figure quality and interpretation

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Language and Presentation

Strengths:

- Generally understandable academic English
- Appropriate terminology used

Minor Issues:

- Frequent **grammar and formatting errors**, e.g.:
 - Missing spaces ("practices.The initiative...")
 - Repeated sentences
- Overly long paragraphs
- Redundancy in:
 - Introduction
 - Literature review

Suggestion:

- Perform **professional language editing**
- Remove redundancy and improve conciseness

Structure and Organization

Strengths:

- Follows general structure (Introduction, Literature Review, Methods, Results, Conclusion)

Minor Concerns:

- **Literature Review is excessively long and disproportionate**
- Duplication of content:
 - Introduction overlaps with literature review
- Figures and tables:
 - Poorly integrated into text
- Section numbering inconsistent (e.g., "3.1 Discussion" under section 4)

Suggestion:

- Reduce literature review significantly
- Improve logical flow:
 - Introduction → Gap → Objectives → Methods → Results → Discussion
- Properly integrate figures and tables

References and Citations

Strengths:

- Includes key foundational authors (Altieri, Gliessman, FAO)
- Mix of theoretical and applied literature

Concerns:

- **Repetition of references** (same citations repeated multiple times)
- Some references incomplete (e.g., "[UN Website]")
- Overuse of:
 - Grey literature
 - Organizational reports
- Inconsistent formatting style

Suggestion:

- Remove duplicates
- Use **consistent citation style (APA/Harvard)**
- Include more **recent peer-reviewed studies**

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Overall Recommendation

The manuscript has **strong potential** due to its relevance and field-based data. However, it requires **minor revisions** to improve scientific rigor, clarity, and structure.

Final Decision:

Minor Revision Required