



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_48332
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers Current Agriculture Practices on Paddy Cultivation and Relationship with Work Performance In Iada Batang Lupar, Sarawak, Malaysia
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The Manuscript is well written and showing a good result of planned research. I suggest the following to the author(s):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some minor grammatical mistakes in the manuscript they should be recheck and correct.</li> <li>Introduction is written well and showing significant work regarding the research problem.</li> <li>Materials and Methods not showing complete information about the materials and methods adopted during the course of investigation. I suggest that incorporate the full information about the plan and execution of research work. The author(s) add this information in results section of manuscript, so it should be separated.</li> <li>Results also good but remove the information about methods adopted during course of investigation.</li> <li>Results also discussed well but some more references need to describe the results strongly.</li> <li>Conclusion and recommendations suited decent as per the results of the study.</li> </ul> <p><b>Line 1: uses. Were, indicates</b>  <b>Line 1: The highest (<math>\beta = 0.463</math>) obtained by harvesting practice- sentences not clear</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The minor grammatical issues were rechecked and resolved</li> <li>Materials and method section was updated as suggested</li> <li>Information on method adopted during course of investigation was removed as suggested</li> <li>Some references were incorporated into the article.</li> <li>Good commendation on conclusion in line with results</li> <li>The sentence on beta value <math>\beta=0.463</math> on harvesting was re-casted and made the sentence more clearer.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	