

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_125255
Title of the Manuscript:	The Economics of Production & Marketing of Oyster Mushroom ( <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> ) in Bukidnon, Philippines
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The study focuses on production and marketing practices of Oyster mushroom in Bukidnon, Philippines, and reasons for ceasing its growth by farmers	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Well appropriate</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>See my comments on the manuscript.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Suitable but there is room for improvement	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### 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>
<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>Oladipo Olaniyi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>