



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_35516
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying sustainability assessment indicators for assessing the sustainability of smallholder integrated farms in coastal West Bengal, India
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is suggested to review the wording and internal logic of the first part of your background information (Lines 23-43). it is not quite clear and it is a little bit hard to follow. Maybe some adjectives are missing or some connectors are lacking. However, the rest of the Introduction is fine. Result tables are not shown in the document. There is not a Discussion section to discuss properly your findings. Here, I would like to see one point addressed, your expert panel works under a particular set of conditions, hence, under different systems and productive objectives elsewhere, other variables could be selected, since they are more relevant for such combination. Do you agree? The first paragraph of Conclusions would be better placed in the previous section.	- The first part of the Introduction section has been revised (refer to the track changed manuscript) - Tables are now sent to the R & D section (refer to the track changed manuscript) - Added a paragraph under Results & Discussion section explaining the selection of indicators (refer to the track changed manuscript) - First paragraph of the Conclusion section has now been sent to the (last paragraph of) Results and Discussion section (refer to the track changed manuscript) - Yes, we agree that the indicators might be different in different conditions. We have mentioned explicitly this in the last paragraph of R & D section
Minor REVISION comments	Lines 2- 27: please check wording Line 279: reference is incomplete	- Checked - Complete now (ref. no. 27)
Optional/General comments	This study is well-designed and conducted and is oriented to a problem quite frequent in the discipline; however, it lacks the acid test of challenging its results under field condition.	Mentioned in the Conclusion section.