



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_15750
Title of the Manuscript:	Main agroforestry systems and their contribution to property reduction in mountainous areas, Vietnam
Type of the 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

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is a very interesting work on the agroforestry systems in Vietnam. But I want to suggest for the following revisions: 1. Title of the paper should be revised, I don't understand what is ' property reduction' (???), is it ' poverty reduction' that author wanted to mean? If so it is not described how the income from agroforestry can reduce poverty. Also the word ' main' is not so convinced. Author should revise the title to a new one that will correspond the main theme of the paper. 2. First few lines of the abstract is a description of agroforestry system, which is unnecessary. Abstract should include very briefly the objective of the research, data collection methods and the results. 3. Author mentioned that field survey was	Thank you for valuable comments to our manuscript. We made considerable changes following your comment as restructure MN to Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion. Title was changed Abstract was rewritten. Section "Data collection" was added.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conducted, but no description was made. More details are needed, e.g., sample size, sampling technique, types of questionnaire/ interview, who are the target population for the survey? 4. Discussions should be solely based on the results and cite other peoples work to support/ compare the result, thus this section need to revise. More citation is needed. 5. Conclusion section needs to add which is absence in this paper 6. Finally, readers will easily confuse which one is the description and which one is the result in this paper. This paper needs to be restructured in a scientific format, i.e. Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgment.	More discussion was made Conclusion was added.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		