

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_116936
Title of the Manuscript:	Beyond "Blind Spots": Illuminating Financial Pathways for Thriving Agrotourism as a Family Business
Type of the 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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. Yes, it is important for the application of a theoretical subject. 2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive enough. 4. I believe that the subsections and structure of the article are appropriate. 5. I think the article is scientifically correct. 6. The references in the article are sufficient.</p> <p>In the study, instead of the first plural subject, the passive structure can be preferred. When there are more than two authors in the references, the use of "et al" should be preferred. 2.21.1. When commenting in the Current Ratio section, it should be commented as current assets are 2.99 times short-term liabilities, not "Liquidity Ratio of 2.99 Indicates that assets are 2.99% more than liabilities to meet immediate Financial Obligations". In addition, liquidity ratios should be enriched with comments when analyzing them. For example; For the current ratio: It can be said that 2.99 is above the standard value of 2 and the company's debt payment ability is sufficient.</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>		

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:	Ismail Ukav
Department, University & Country	Adiyaman University, Turkey