

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	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Agritourism, as an integral part of tourism in rural areas, is an area of interest at the moment, especially as it is a family business. Identifying the key points to make agritourism profitable and bring income to the families involved in agritourism is welcome and of interest to communities that deal with agriculture as their main livelihood.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is a little over-extended, but well done (as required by the journal).</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure and subsection of the manuscript are appropriate for a research article.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient (21) and more of them are over 2010 (19).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have made some corrections in the full article with the red colour. After these corrections, the article can be published, in my point of view.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai- Iacob Bentea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj-Napoca, Romania