

ARPG Review form

Journal Name	Journal of Agriculture and Crops
--------------	----------------------------------

Does this article meet the scope of this journal?

Yes	X
No	

This form will be used for reviews of submitted research articles.

1. Introduction: Does the first paragraph serve as a good introduction?*

Yes	
No	X

2. Suggest, if possible, ways to improve the introduction.*

What is the research motivation? And how does the author arrange the organization of the paper? Ex: Part 1 explains the background and purpose, Part 2 displays the methods and so on.

3. Structure: Rate the author's line of argumentation.*

Very Good	
Good	
Average	X
Poor	
Very Poor	

4. Editing: Did you find any problems with:*

Grammar	X
Punctuation	X
Spelling	X
Word use	X

5. Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	<i>Authors are required to follow specific constructive comments and recommendations.</i>
Review of literature	<i>This session is unwritten and unexplained.</i>
Methodology:	<i>The author uses the Location Quotient (LQ) approach, why is it not explained here? Then,</i>

ARPG Review form

	<i>what is the formula? This is a fatal error that does not explain the analysis method. I suggest viewing and citing publications that discuss LQ</i>
Results:	<i>Any wrong formula and must be corrected. In addition, the citation does not refer to a "formulation" from a reputable journal.</i>
Discussion:	<i>The discussion not only compares the output/results of the analysis with national case studies, but also internationally/globally. In the context of the dynamics in the findings, it also critically highlights the transformation that is not only concerned with the economy, but also on environmental sustainability.</i>
Policy Suggestion	<i>Not explicitly framed and there are major corrections.</i>
Bibliography/References:	<i>There are three major errors in "References". First, citing too many domestic journals. If the authors still apply it, should change to "English". Second, you can cite reputable foreign journals (e.g. Scopus and WoS) that are relevant to this study. Third, there are still many articles and books in the national language.</i>
Others:	<i>Abbreviations without a clear definition.</i>
Decision:	<i>Accepted with major corrections.</i>

6. **Please rate the following:** (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = Poor)

<i>Contribution to the Field:</i>	
<i>Technical Quality:</i>	3
<i>Clarity of Presentation :</i>	2
<i>Depth of Research:</i>	3

SECTION V - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark with an X)

Accept As It Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	X
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	

Note: Would you like to review again the paper after receiving the revised file from the author?

ARPG Review form

Yes	X
No	