

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_121062
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender Perspectives on Farmers' Livelihood Resources in Dryland Farming Communities of Lombok Island, Indonesia
Type of the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	This manuscript misses every aspect of a good research paper. It does not specify the objectives of the study and hypotheses. The data collected for study is limited and it can't be used to predict the behaviour of all. The analysis part is not attractive and simple statistics used are not given properly. No general conclusion of the study given.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is lengthy and not catchy. 'Gender perspectives on Livelihood resources of farmers in Lombok Island, Indonesia' would be a better choice.	
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 does not specify or reveal what has done in study. Abstract must cover the summarized form of the research. The methodology part is not included in it. Its not comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of article not good. It must have good introduction review of related studies, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, methodology and data analysis tools. All are missing.	
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.	This manuscript is not scientifically correct and technically sound. It has to be revised and added the missing parts. Even the tabular presentation is not attractive of correct. The sample data has to be increased .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but a review is not given .	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is good but the composition of article is very poor and not well structured.	
Optional/General comments	This article can be sent for revision and correcting the analysis part. Crosstab can be used to compare the gender differences and tabular presentation to be given with best care.	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joben K Antony
Department, University & Country	St.Thomas College Autonomous, India