

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127129
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Rice Productivity and Sustainable Food Security In Bantul Regency
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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.	Authors highlights there conclusion based on the single year secondary data. Authors used data from 2017 to 2023 but they used only one year 2023 for analysis or comparison which cannot scientifically reflect correct results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes Suitable but authors can add some text and explanation for the word sustainability	
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 includes all relevant information.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate But there are repetition of table 1 ass table 2. Authors can add extra row for percentage change data for more visibility in table 1 or they can draw a simple diagram for more visibility.	
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.	To guarantee the quality and reliability of the findings, the study's data gathering and analysis procedures adhered to scientific standards. They used secondary data from 2017 to 2023 but he used only one year 2023 for analysis or comparison which cannot scientifically reflect correct results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, lack of recent and sufficient reference. There is a lack of review of literature section in this manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	Need improvement	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santosh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Purnea University, India