

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103454
Title of the Manuscript:	The Fifth Industrial Revolution in Agricultural Sciences
Type of the Article	Letter to the Editor

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 1.7

PART 1: Review 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This letter to the editor is written in a way to show the importance of the fifth industrial revolution with regard to agriculture, so it has a wide impact on agriculture.</p> <p>2. The title is clear and short enough, and there is nothing to be changed.</p> <p>3. There is no abstract because this article is a letter to the editor.</p> <p>4. There is only one part, which is directly rewritten to the editor, mentioning and describing the importance of the fifth industrial revolution.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. Many references are given to support the statements within the letter, but the first part of the writing seems to lack concrete support because the same citation is written three times, which is meaningless. Normally, when there is no other reference in between, only one reference should be rewritten at the last of the statement. However, it is not the case because the first part of the writing is too long for one reference to support. Therefore, the author is recommended to provide additional references to support the first part.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality found in this article is very high because there are some repetitive mistakes related to the capitalization of the words written midst the sentences. So the author should think about capitalization rules for better writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia