

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_75664
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF ANCHOR BORROWERS PROGRAMME ON RICE FARMING
Type of the Article	Empirical research

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. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please highlight the results of the 'red mark' reviewers comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References need to be added, especially from studies that apply to the needs of this paper. They need this in order to enrich research and comparisons with case studies in various developing countries that have an agricultural sector base and Indonesia's leading commodities such as rice. Then, what is the author's theoretical basis? The reviewers noted that this study was empirically based and requires testing that based on supported hypotheses. Finally, the authors do not include the weaknesses of the study. Though this is important as an agenda for the development of future studies. Reference sections proposed by reviewers are mandatory.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The title needs to be shortened so that it does not cause double perception and is easy for future readers to understand.

Review Form 1.6

Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	Clear
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	Reviewers didn't find that

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)	Considered with a note of
Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	

PART 5: Reviewer Details:

This information is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate properly.
Certificate preparation will not be possible if incomplete information is received.

Name of the Reviewer	Erwin Kurniawan, S.E., M.Si
Department of Reviewer	Department of Economics
University or Institution of Reviewer	Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Mulawarman
Country of Reviewer	Indonesia