

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95888
Title of the Manuscript:	Demographics of Pili Farmers and their Production Capacity in Bicol Region, Philippines
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes! Content is good for scientific community practices but alteration need high consideration due to the requirements of scientists language practice.</p> <p>Yes! But addition of Evaluation might made it sound more logically than only Demographic.</p> <p>It is comprehensive only botanical names serves little importance in abstract than in introduction.</p> <p>Subsections are lacking in the manuscript, only main sections are structure correctly.</p> <p>With changes in sentences, it can be scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient only lack alphabetically sequentially placement. The author lost uniformity in some words e.g % sometimes write (percent). Longer sentences confuse readers sometimes. Glossary was necessary to explain unknown abbreviations.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Yes! Although somewhere is incorrectly place due to be not a home language of the author	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
	The article manuscript need the author to dedicate on it, so-that it can meet required publication standards. It is informative and creative for science family.	

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Makkies David Lengwati
Department, University & Country	South Africa