



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9202
Title of the Manuscript:	Modern Farming Technologies: Impact on Farm Productivity and Food Security in the Rice Terraces of the Cordillera Region, Northern Philippines
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	Line 226-271: what is the implication of this finding? You need to discuss the implications of technology adoption (both positive and negative) on the environment, crop yields, income and livelihood Line 320-321: Farmers must learn to..... move this the recommendations section, which should come after the conclusion Line 325-330: this does appear to be coming from your study. None of the data presented in this study can verify the claims in the statement. You either remove the statement or bring data to support it.	Some of the implications are already cited in the paper. The statement was deleted in the document and replaced.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 39-40: provide reference Line 46: separate 1970s and brought Line 47: change should read changed Line 50-52: provide reference Line 54: the series of changes that have and not has Line 57: This is the basic question that this study sought to provide an answer Line 71: separate of from soil Line 77: academia or academe Line 96: separate the from selected Line 124: Persisted Line 133-138: the word varieties fits better than cultivars Line 133: traditional rice varieties that have endured and not has endured Line 142-153: arrange the figures in Table 2 properly Line 192: frequent droughts made the soil hard Line 195: separate the from adoption	Revisions are already integrated in the document.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 216: delete current Line 241-250: Align the entries in Table 5 Line 254: replace has with have Line 273: remove may Line 273: remove the availability of Line 280: remove both Line 313: technologies are some of and not is one of Line 313: remove mandatory Line 315: surplus produce and not surplus production Line 324: cater for and not cater to	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well conceptualized but has very limited reference to previous research works. It also requires in-depth discussion of the results.	