Journal Name:	Asian Basic and Applied Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ABAARJ_1763**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Food Security: A Strategy For Poverty Alleviation In Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Research Article**

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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.	This article examines the essential topic of poverty alleviation through food security in Nigeria, concentrating on a country with high poverty rates despite its abundant resources. The study's use of the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model provides unique insight into the short- and long-term effects of food security policies, which could help to shape policy decisions in Nigeria and other developing countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The existing title, "Food Security: A Strategy for Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria," is straightforward and appropriate. A slight edit could be made to "Examining Food Security as a Strategy for Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria" to be more precise.	
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 is generally comprehensive, presenting the research problem, methodology, and key findings. To enhance it, a brief mention of the specific statistical outcomes (e.g., the significance of labor participation rate in the short term) would add precision.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is appropriate, with distinct sections covering the introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. Each section flows logically, allowing readers to follow the study's approach and findings clearly.	
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 appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The ARDL model is appropriately selected for evaluating the impact of various economic factors on poverty alleviation. The findings are clearly explained and aligned with the theoretical framework of multidimensional poverty, adding depth to the analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The references are current and sufficient, including sources from recent years. However, adding a few more policy-related references could make it even more practical for readers involved in policy.	

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality is adequate, but there are minor grammatical errors and word choice issues that could benefit from a final proofreading to make it clearer.	
Optional/General comments	No additional 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mafruha Binte Shameem**
Department, University & Country	**Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh**