

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_126554
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Agricultural Extension in Conflict Affected Areas of Mindanao, Philippines
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
-		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>After Review Comments:</p> <p>On Abstract</p> <p>This study offers a valuable assessment of agricultural extension in conflict-affected areas, highlighting its potential to enhance livelihoods, social capital, and peace building in Mindanao. The model's application and findings are clear, with impressive results in economic improvement, social cohesion, and environmental practices. I recommend expanding the discussion on specific peace building mechanisms, clarifying methodological limitations, and providing more detailed insights into the linkages between agricultural practices and environmental outcomes.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>This introduction effectively outlines the historical, social, and economic context of conflict in Mindanao and its impact on agricultural livelihoods. The 'LIFE' model's principles are well-aligned with participatory and decentralized approaches, emphasizing farmer empowerment and peace building. However, the introduction could benefit from additional context on how the model specifically addresses gender-based challenges and the role of extension in fostering resilience amidst multi-faceted conflicts. Study is timely and relevant for sustainable development in conflict-affected areas. Clarifying the application of the evaluation criteria within the case studies would also strengthen the setup.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>The methodology section provides a clear outline of the case study sites, sample size, data collection, and analytical approach. However, more detail on the sampling strategy and any challenges faced during data collection would strengthen transparency. It would also be beneficial to specify the rationale for using a paired t-test over other potential analyses, and to discuss any limitations of self-assessment measures in capturing nuanced changes in KASA and social capital. Overall, the methods are well-chosen and appropriate for evaluating the impact of the LIFE model on these communities.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>The results section provides a detailed and comprehensive overview of the demographic, economic, social, and environmental impacts of the LIFE model. The significant improvements across income, lifestyle, KASA, social capital, and environmental practices are well-documented and reinforce the model's efficacy. However, greater clarity in presenting quantitative data—such as using more charts or tables for ease of comparison—would enhance readability. Additionally, providing a more nuanced analysis of demographic impacts on outcomes, especially regarding gender differences, would deepen the insights. Overall, the findings highlight a meaningful shift towards sustainable livelihoods in conflict-affected areas.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusions</p> <p>The discussion and conclusions effectively highlight the LIFE model's positive impacts across economic, social, and environmental domains, providing a persuasive case for its role in livelihood enhancement and conflict resilience. The link to Longley et al. (2006) and the contextual insights on conflict-affected rural livelihoods reinforce the relevance of the model's self-help approach in Mindanao. The statistically significant results on income, KASA, social capital, and environmental practices underscore the model's multidimensional impact. However, it would strengthen the discussion to consider potential challenges or limitations of the LIFE model in diverse conflict settings. Additionally, future studies could benefit from a comparative analysis of similar models to better generalize findings across contexts.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Reference</p> <p>The references provide a solid theoretical foundation for the LIFE model evaluation, linking agricultural extension with sustainable rural livelihoods, social capital, and conflict-affected areas. Key works, such as Birkhaeuser et al. (1991) on economic impacts of extension, Scoones (1998) on sustainable livelihoods, and Farr (2004) on social capital, substantiate the multidimensional approach to the analysis. The inclusion of longitudinal studies, such as Menz & Predo (2019), enriches understanding of LIFE's financial sustainability. For clarity and depth, integrating recent perspectives (e.g., World Bank 2011 on conflict and development) strengthens the broader implications of agricultural extension in challenging contexts.</p> <p>Tables and figures</p> <p>The tables and figure present a comprehensive quantitative summary of the LIFE model's impacts. Table 1 highlights significant income and savings increases, with paired t-test results. Table 2 showing statistically robust changes. Table 3 effectively illustrates lifestyle improvements in spending on essentials and agricultural inputs, indicating enhanced well-being and financial resilience. The high average change levels. Table 4 for KASA (Knowledge, Attitude, Skills, and Aspirations) further support the model's developmental impact. Table 5 on social capital changes reinforces the model's influence on group dynamics, institutional connections, and community trust, though the slight variations in trust between communities could be noted for further exploration.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harshit Paliwal
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, India