

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAERI_117950
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF SOURCES AND DIVERSIFICATION OF FARMERS' HOUSEHOLD INCOME AROUND PT JEMBAYAN MUARA BARA, TENGGARONG SEBERANG DISTRICT
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript address issue in terms of the sustainability of the rural farmers. The diversification of the farmers through off-farm income activities will greatly assist in improving their livelihoods.</li> <li>2. The title is suitable, but I suggest that the name of the district and country should be included.</li> <li>3. The abstract is too long, and it includes a unnecessary words. I suggest that the abstract should be reduced to 300 words and should be written in the past tense.</li> <li>4. The structure is appropriate, but I suggest that the author/s should include a Research Methodology section under Section 2.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The author/s only cited one reference per section. This is not sufficient to provide a good academic background.</li> </ol> <p>The introduction does not include sufficient background information and it should include the research questions the study will be addressing. It is proposed that the author/s should include additional information in the introduction.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The quality of the language is excellent.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>See my additional in track changes in the manuscript.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Benjamin Manasoe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa</b>