

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_112019
Title of the Manuscript:	Imperfect factor mobility, agricultural producer service and agricultural development in developing economy
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>The study was poorly conceptualized and lacked the necessary information to contribute to the scientific body of knowledge in the field of agriculture. There is no methodology, results, or discussion. It's challenging to understand how the conclusion was reached.</p> <p>The title is not easy to understand. The suggested title: Assessment of the impact of agricultural services on increased factor mobility in rural development.</p> <p>The abstract would need to be revised once the required elements of sound scientific research are met. The subsections and structure are inappropriate. There is no methodology, results, or discussion.</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientifically correct based on the following: 1. No methodology: no information provided about the study area, study population, sample size, sampling method, data collection, collection methods, variables measured and how, data analysis, and methods used, etc. 2. No results. 3. No discussions.</p> <p>Most of the references used are recent, but additional references will be needed when discussing the results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seabata Maoba
Department, University & Country	South Africa