



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37275
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of the agriculture land price assessment in Albania
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	In the abstract, the authors of the manuscript describe the content of the paper, methods used in its processing and briefly the results. I can recommend to the authors a concise but precise definition of the objectives of their study within the abstract of which contribution of the manuscript, i.e. own contribution of the authors to the subject solved, would be a part. The introductory chapter presents the authors' motivation. The authors of the manuscript justify here the need for exploration in the area. An absolutely precise definition of the study objectives including the methods and procedures leading to their achievement would be a part of the introductory chapter. A much better search of existing knowledge on the subject would be a part in the introductory chapter. I can also recommend to the authors of this manuscript the exact formulation of the research hypothesis that they will try to prove by their research. On the other hand, the manuscript has a logical structure and arrangement. As a part of the conclusion chapter, I can recommend to present some suggestions for further research in the field.	Fully agree with the recommendations of the reviewer. Kindly note that they are addressed in the paper as the following: 1. The study objectives are well-defined in the abstract. Almost the entire abstract was revised clarifying the originality of the research as well as the specific contribution of the authors. 2. The hypothesis, objectives and methods used are provided in the introduction. The methods used are further elaborated in the methodological approach. 3. Further suggestions are provided in the conclusions as research questions for additional work in the evaluation of the three methods of land valuation.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		