



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_44372
Title of the Manuscript:	The Evaluation of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Governorate Size Distribution
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sentence on line 91 should be redrafted to read "Also, other data sources were (not will be) obtained from ..."</li> <li>• Which analysis of the study produced the result that led to the conclusion of line 254? The study focused on periods of 2004, 2010 and 2014 based on the census figures for these periods. How then was the statement of line 254 arrived at? Is it based on the citation of lines 123 &amp; 124? If yes, then it should be made succinctly clear.</li> <li>• The highlights under the 'Results and Discussion' section of the paper should be clearly linked to the specific section of the analysis that produced the result in order not to put the reader into confusion. In fact, I suggest that the results and discussions be placed after the main analysis of the study (reported in the figures and tables).</li> <li>• The last statement under the conclusion section which starts from line 276 should read "it is important to stimulate Urban development in order (not in other) ....." Also, this statement should be clearly isolated as recommendation and not part of the conclusion; otherwise, the author should tag that section 'Conclusion and Recommendation'.</li> <li>• Table 3 (Under the appendix) should be Saudi Arabia Population Distribution Hierarchy for '2014' not '2004'.</li> <li>• What reference style did the author adopt? I recommend the use of APA style (6<sup>th</sup> edition) or any other style the Journal considers appropriate but the author must show consistency in</li> </ul>	<b>Author's comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• Yes, it came from the citation of these lines.</li> <li>• We made the editing.</li> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• We follow the link below.</li> </ul>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>whichever reference style used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The quality of the paper will improve, if the author (s) adds empirical evidence from existing related literatures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As we mention in line 22, there were a few related studies such as references 1-4. However, we related our result to there found.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The author(s) presented a fair skill in advance research of this sort. The paper's relevance is not in doubt. The general organization, presentation and methodology adopted in the study are adjudged sound and adequate. The paper however lacks sufficient evidence of empirical literature review.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> ( <i>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</i> )
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p><b>No ethical issue is noticed.</b></p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>