



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_33022
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Productivity Growth in Philippine Swine Production
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	Good job! The lay out of the paper is great and it shows that the researcher did their job thoroughly. However here are some suggestions; • Since the author deemed the main objective of this paper (in the abstract) to be to clarify if swine farm productivity has become environmentally sustainable over time, adding time series analysis for the 13 years mentioned (2002-2015) just to support the tool that was used (ESMP) might be very helpful to compare the productivity at different times relative to the environmental situation at a given time.	Thank you very much to the referee for taking the time to review my manuscript and for the incisive insights to improve it. • While it is indeed ideal to use time series data for the 13 years between 2002-2015, this is unfortunately not possible because there is no time series data available particularly for the inputs used in swine production in the Philippines (This is already mentioned in lines 149 to 152 of the paper). What is provided by the CountryStat Philippines and Philippine Statistics Authority is time series data for volume of output of swine production and animal population/inventory. There is also no time series data available for environmental indicators in swine production such as BOD, N, and P. Thus, the paper relies on the only comprehensive farm level survey that was conducted by FAO-DFID-IFPRI-UPLB in 2002 (of which the author was a collaborator) and the 2015 field data that the author personally conducted using the same survey instrument in 2002 and interviewing the same respondents who were still raising pigs in 2015. In view of this limitation to provide time series data, it is hoped that it is acceptable if the author just revise the tone of objective (in the abstract) so that it reads as 'to clarify if swine farm productivity has become environmentally sustainable in a developing country like the Philippines'.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• The author should consider creating a section towards the end of the paper or somewhere next to the references that talks about the recommendations that can be made after this research. • More meat can be added on the impact of neglecting this section of the economy (swine production) The author may want to spend a little more time on talking about the benefits of this sector of the economy and compare the most benefited time period of the economy to the time the economy has least benefits from swine production and say what the reasons might be for such changes.	• A section on the recommendations following this research is provided in lines 526 to 547 and highlighted in yellow. • A paragraph that talks about the impact of neglecting swine production is added in lines 64 to 71 and highlighted in yellow. • The discussion of the differential benefits from the swine sector and swine production as well as the possible reasons for changes in the level of benefits are interspersed in lines 38 to 60 and highlighted in yellow.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	• The author may consider removing the round bracket that is after the box bracket in line 19. • The author may have to check the standard referencing style	• The round bracket after the box bracket in line 19 is actually for the enclosure of the reference that is cited, i.e., (UN 2010 and Bruinsma 2009 as quoted in [2]). I hope it is ok to retain the round bracket after the box bracket. • The referencing style has been checked and revised accordingly.