



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. The introduction section is too lengthy. Some discussion on study methodology can be separated in a new section with the same heading "Study Methodology". 2. Please check to make sure that the direction on each figure is correct. The positioning of the compass in each figure is the same. But, the orientation of each figure displays variable orientations. 3. Naming of the study areas is not the same as in the text (Figure 2). Why? 4. L111-112, "preserved in fairly stable." is an incomplete sentence. 5. The positioning of Figure 4a is ahead of its call-out position. 6. The short form for hectares is "ha" (L231) and should be unified throughout the entire text. 7. An additional village map may be helpful along with the discussion in L263-268.	1. Amended: A new chapter of 'Method' Added. The article amended in accordance with the new chapter. 2. Excluding Figure 7, all other figures are oriented to the north. It is very difficult to be precise with text-editing tools. Compass near each chart is marking the general direction only. 3. Figure 1 and Figure 2 are intended to describe the situation today with the latest tool of Google Maps. Of course, this tool was not available during the years 1921-1991. 4. Amended: ... preserved in a fairly stable setup. 5. Amended 6. Amended 7. That's just part of the difficulty. It was not possible to find a map of those years.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. The meaning of the sentence “they were worked in the” (L267-268) is unclear? 9. Discussions on the moshav agricultural system outweighed the kibbutz agricultural system. Why? 10. The use of section heading “Comparison” (L436) is not clear. 11. The concluding remarks can be more precise leaving out repeated narrative on the review results. 12. Implications from the two important conclusions of this study are needed to enhance the contributing values of this review study.	8. Amended: and after the lands were transferred to the Kibbutz and to the Moshav, they were cultivated in accordance with the typical way for each of these communities 9. The family farm is the center of the discussion. The kibbutz was a control group to examine historical changes over seven decades. 10. Amended 11. Amended 12. Amended
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Improvement on some of the English syntax errors may greatly enhance readability.	13. Amended: The article has been edited again
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A well-written article that deserves good attention and publicity. However, descriptive on some sections is too lengthy. They needs to be substantial condensed in order to enhance conciseness and readability.	14. Amended: Descriptions omitted in different parts of the text