



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_19189
Title of the Manuscript:	PROCESSES OF DEVELOPMENT AS REFLECTED IN LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES IN ISRAEL, 1921-1991, A CASE STUDY OF THE MOSHAV VS. THE KIBBUTZ
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

	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	1. Provide section for material and methods. Explain how the information presented was generated and processed. 2. Another section of results and discussion can be created as highlighted in the main text, 3. Place the titles of Figures below the specific Figure. 4. References should be improved. For instance, in the text there is Gal & Hadas (2012) in the reference it is indicated Hadas & Gal (2012). Ozer (1978) appears in the text but in the reference you get Ozer & Blanchfield (1978). In the text is Lavie (1944) but in the reference is Lavis (1944). Applebaum & Sofer (2004) in the text becomes Sofer & Applebaum (2004).	1. Amended: A new chapter of 'Method' Added. The article amended in accordance with the new chapter. 2. Amended 3. Amended: 3.The titles of Figures are below the figures. 4. Amended: ✓ Hadas E. and Gal Y. (2012) - Gal Y. and Hadas E. (2013) ✓ Ozer and Blanchfield ✓ Lavie S. (1944) ✓ Applebaum & Sofer (2004) and Sofer & Applebaum (2004) are two different sources. 5. Comments in a PDF file: Amended



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Concluding remark should also be forward looking. What is the current situation in comparison to the situation described in the story? In some cases proposals for further studies are made.	6. Amended
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is excellent work. However, it is important for the author to explain how he/she generated this information (methods/methodology).	7. Amended