

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_119633
Title of the Manuscript:	MATHEMATICAL APPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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> <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. The paper covers and suggests a wide series of concrete possibilities and examples where to utilize mathematics and mathematical models in agriculture not only to improve an income from agricultural activities but also to incorporate mathematical models e.g. for optimal usage of sources.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, IMHO the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are IMHO sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7. I would suggest to make borders of the cells in Tables 2 and 3 as well as to consider non-uniform wideness of the columns (to reduce the 1st one to save some additional space for the 2nd and the 3rd columns) to improve the readability of the tables.</p> <p>8. I would suggest to write all the mathematical variables (in Section 6) in italics text mode or in the mathematical mode.</p> <p>9. Conclusion should be Section 7, not 6.</p> <p>10. typo, p.8, 2 lines below Fig.1: : "A two-way layout ... design (RBD) or a randomized complete block design (RCBD) if,..." should be RCBD in the second bracket, not RCB;</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. IMHO, the language quality is high. Nevertheless, my spell checker suggests to use modelling with double l.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper is nice and correctly written. I have found only one typo and only minor places for my suggestions. I suggest to publish the paper.</p> <p>I do not need to review the revised version.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jan Eisner
Department, University & Country	University of South Bohemia in Ceske Budejovice, Czechia