

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAERI_125768</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Farmers' Lifestyles in Rural Turkey on the Sustainability of Agricultural Production</b>
Type of the Article	Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This article highlights how farmers' social activities affect agricultural practices and sustainability. The focus on Turkey's rural agricultural practices fills a significant gap by demonstrating how informal networks and community interactions shape farming outcomes. The study is useful for policymakers looking to promote sustainable practices by focusing on community-based solutions.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title is mostly appropriate but could be more concise. I recommend: <i>"The Impact of Farmers' Social Lifestyles on Agricultural Sustainability in Rural Turkey."</i></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but contains too many details that belong in the main body. I suggest focusing only on key elements—such as the problem, methodology, key findings, and significance. Avoid unnecessary background details and mention the importance of specific findings without elaborating too much.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure is generally appropriate, but some subsections in the Findings and Discussion section could be rearranged under thematic headings (e.g., "Impact of Social Networks on Decision-Making"). This would enhance clarity and make the manuscript easier to follow.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust, using appropriate methods such as logistic regression to explore the relationship between socio-economic factors and farmer's social participation. The survey covers a representative sample from various provinces, which adds depth to the analysis. However, the study would benefit from a clearer explanation of how specific variables (e.g., survival status of spouse) impact agricultural sustainability. Additionally, limitations related to qualitative insights should be acknowledged. Overall, the findings align with the literature on rural sociology and agricultural sustainability.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>Most references are relevant, but some are outdated (e.g., Rogers 2003). Adding recent studies from the past five years would improve the paper, particularly in the areas of agricultural policy and rural sociology. Adding comparative references from similar regions (e.g., rural communities in Eastern Europe) could enhance the literature review.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript uses clear academic language, but minor grammatical improvements are needed. Additionally, avoid redundancy in sections such as the conclusion, where ideas are repeated.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The article offers useful insights and can guide policymakers. Adding specific suggestions like organizing agricultural fairs alongside local religious and social events would make the recommendations more actionable. Restructuring the results into themes would also improve the flow. No competing interest issues were found. There are no apparent ethical issues in the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into agricultural. However, it requires revisions for better clarity, updated references, and more actionable recommendations. These changes will make it stronger and more relevant for policymakers.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mafruha Binte Shameem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh</b>