

## 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The economic analysis of production is important with respect to the study area. Because it is widely cultivating in that area. This manuscript explains different production channels and distributions and concluded with an economic approach. It is also highlighting the lack of government support for equipment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is. Title is perfectly suitable.	
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.	The abstract was written in a very comprehensive manner but also covered the importance of the topic, methodology adopted and findings from the analysis. If it is possible author can remove unwanted symbols such as ;,;. Additional Keywords can be added at the end of abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript can be improved by making some more subsections if possible.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Number of references are sufficient. All are mentioned recent ones.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language that was used in this manuscript is standard English and can be suitable for this manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinnakota Yesubabu
Department, University & Country	KCAET, Kerala Agricultural University, India