



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_30765
Title of the Manuscript:	COOPERATIVE AND CONTRACT FARMING FOR EXPORT CROPS IN THE GUATEMALA HIGHLANDS
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>)



SDI 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	1. The result section is combined with discussion. However no references are included comparing this study to other studies carried out earlier. 2. The results are described and tables inserted without guidance when to refer to which table (Table 2 and 3). Authors should link the described results to the respective tables for clarity. 3. It is confusing when the authors give references in the conclusion section. The authors should clearly separate results, discussion, conclusion and recommendation. 4. The Abstract is missing. If present not titled and too long. 5. Key words that describe the study are missing	1. In another previous article for this Journal we had to modify in the opposite direction. We had to remove the references from this section and move them to the Conclusions. This answers also to point 3. 2. Done. We have included reference to tables 3 and 4. Numbers have been modified because another Reviewer asked to introduce a new Table, no. 2. 3. See comment 1) here above 4. It was a mistake of the lay – out. We had sent the Summary. However, it was too long and another Reviewer suggested to make it shorter. We did it. Not it is 299 words, within the ceiling of 300. 5. We have added again the key words
Minor REVISION comments	1. The use of the term small farmer in line 54; was it meant to mean small holder farmers? Clarify. 2. Line 81-86, 104- 107, 232-241, 359-363, 412-415 sentences too long. 3. include reference for line 232 at “population parameters”	1. We have added smallholder to clarify 2. 81-86: done, 104-17 done, 232-241 we have cut the sentence, 359-363 cut into two sentences, 412-415 cut into two sentences. PS: we are conscious that readability is based on a) short sentences with b) short words... but this applies mainly to people with lower education. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flesch%E2%80%93Kincaid_readability_tests
Optional/General comments		

We = the authors, wish to thank you for your time and for your suggestions. We did our best to meet your suggestions and to improve our article, by taking into account also the comments and suggestions of the other two Reviewers.