

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_93243
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role Of Agricultural Sector In Food Security And Poverty Alleviation In Indonesia And Turkey
Type of the Article	Original Research 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The literature review (particularly empirics) of this paper is scanty. Several studies exist on agriculture, food security and poverty alleviation. This is so important given the exploratory research method employed. This will create the basis for analysis and discussion of findings. <b>NB:</b> 80% of the empirics should capture more recent works (studies not older than 10 years).</li> <li>2. Data and results should be presented before discussing them. It is not clear if what the author(s) have presented as results and discussion were actually results/discussion. They are more like literature review.</li> <li>3. Justify your findings with the empirics reviewed that are consistent with your findings. But where such does not exist, justify the possible reason(s).</li> <li>4. Works not reviewed should not be used to justify findings. E.g Eştürk and Ören, 2014: 193, Niyaz et al, 2012: 210-211; Oriola (2009) and Mukhlis (2019), etc. This will be partly addressed when point (2) above is treated.</li> <li>5. Unlike Indonesia, also spell out the nexus between agriculture, food security and poverty alleviation in Turkey.</li> <li>6. The author(s) should craft working definition of keys concepts.</li> <li>7. Not all citations are referenced e.g Jenkins and Scanlan (2001).</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citation not necessary in conclusion and recommendations.</li> <li>2. The author(s) should justify the reason for choosing the location of study (why Indonesia and Turkey?).</li> <li>3. Abstract not well crafted.</li> <li>4. Editorial work still needed.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper will be publishable if these compulsory revision comments are addressed. However, the paper would have been better if it adopted ex post facto research design as key data needed for the study actually existed. This would have allowed for both qualitative and quantitative analysis that guarantees reliable and unbiased findings.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Ijuo Odike</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Benue State University, Nigeria</b>