

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_76600 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THE EFFECT OF PERSONAL FACTORS AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT ON CONSUMERS OF ORGANIC VEGETABLES IN SURABAYA CITY |
| 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>Dear authors, while this paper is quite interesting, it needs to undergo very many changes. Some suggestions are the following, which I hope will help you with your paper.</p> <p>The whole paper has to be re-written and reorganized and set on a different basis. (Since as it is presented, I get the feeling that it is a part of a PhD or master thesis, that suits a conference but not a journal, and for so, needs to be reorganized). The second issue is that it needs to be given for proof reading and editing.</p> <p>Introduction section needs to be rewritten. You need "to build up" your introduction stating the problem, gap, research questions, aim, specific objectives and your contribution to academia. This means that you have to state very clearly the aim and specific objectives, which one by one you will answer and discuss in the paper and which are based on the gaps in academia which you have found. Hence, the research gap and novelty of the study are not clearly articulated.</p> <p>What are the gaps in academic literature that you are going to fill? What are the research questions deriving from these gaps?</p> <p>How are these then converted to aim and objectives (specific)? This means that you need to provide with specific objectives that you are in following addressing, that are one by one analyzed and discussed (otherwise it is just another plain descriptive paper and we do not need to read this one).</p> <p>How does your aim and objectives if answered reduce the gap in academia?</p> <p>After stating your specific objectives, please inform us what gaps you are reducing by answering to them. Also state to whom is important the results of the study.</p> <p>Your literature review is shallow and not well articulated. This is mainly because you have not formulated specific research questions and objectives, which will lead you to the literature review needed.</p> <p>Methodology needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>The discussion section too has to be done based on each result-objective and in line with the results found of the paper.</p> <p>Theoretical implication: what does this study add to academia?</p> <p>Practical implications based on the results of your study.</p> <p>Did not find limitations of the research</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>For better visibility on databases, the authors are asked not to repeat among keywords the words/concepts included in the title of the article.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The subject of the article is interesting, and it is linked to the objectives of the journal, however, there are many issues that have to be reconsidered.</p> <p>Please note that since you do not have "heavy" statistics, the paper must be presented in a "state of art" in all the other areas.</p> <p>I hope that these comments will help you with your work Best of luck with your paper and be safe!</p> | |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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: | <i>Felix Arion</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania</i> |