

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_101193
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the impact of integrating agriculture and tourism on the ecological environment in rural Hunan Province: A study of the rural revitalization movement
Type of the Article	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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript present some scientific information's for the community related to the results obtained from the data and could be useful and meaningful for the community in the aspects of agricultural tourism. 2. The title is suitable. 3. It is suggested that the author put the further prospect of this study in the conclusion part. 4. The structure of the article is well-knit. 5. The article represents the good structure and divided in sections, well treated the problematic of the research and scientifically is correct. 6. The references are in the sufficient count, but could be added more to treat an excellent the literature review in the manner to polish a little bit it. <p>In order to make the article more complete, it is suggested that the author to put in the end of conclusions a brief introduction of the shortcomings of this study the prospects of future research (future directions).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language is in the good way and readably for the scholars. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Finally, I hereby recommend that this article be accepted and be considered for publication after minor corrections.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elvis Elezaj
Department, University & Country	University "Haxhi Zeka", Kosovo