



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. What is your research design? 2. What is the problem? 3. Line 21 is not clear 4. In line 24 talk of household size 5. Line 43 should be by 2015 not in 2015 6. Line 45 should be 'For both goals to be achieved' 7. Line 56 'by smallholders' 8. Bring out the socioeconomic characteristics of this study. 9. Show how you got your results. Both descriptive and inferential. Where is the equation?	1) It is explained at the beginning of the methodology 2) It is explained at lines 48-56 of the 2nd version of our paper 3) Line 21 was part of the abstract; see it now 4) As above 5) Done 6) Done 7) Done 8) We do not understand this comment. The whole paper is about socioeconomic characteristics. 9) We did not reproduce any formula, because formula are available and explained in the books indicated in the text, mainly the no. 11.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Proof read your work. There are many grammatical errors.	We think now it is ok. Thanks
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	

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.