

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107409
Title of the Manuscript:	LEVEL OF DERIVED BENEFITS IN FPOs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write few sentences.)	The manuscript is important for the scientific community. The study examines evidence that certain kinds of organizations are helpful to farmers and support economic development.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative)	The title of the article is suitable	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and brief.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All subsections and structures of the article are appropriate	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The last paragraph before the conclusion has a faulty interpretation. I will explain below	

Review Form 1.7

<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient, especially for a three-page article.</p>	
<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>7.</p>	<p>, it is clear that the level of derived benefits has established a positive and significant relationship at a five percent level of probability with the performance of Farmer Producer Organizations' performance. Xu (2018) reported that sharing of technology and market information involves large and favorable effects on the income of the stakeholders. This is exhibited by having common objectives and cooperative social circumstances (The above interpretation of statistical result is faulty. Although the correlation is positive, the "t" value does not lead to a conclusion of significance at 5%, not even at 20% significant. If the lack of statistical significance supports the theory, then this should be stated in the body of the text and explained).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language / English quality needs substantial improvement. I have made corrections (attached)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		
	<p>I have made extensive corrections to the manuscript. Corrections are marked in red. Deletions are indicated. Comments for clarification are marked in green.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Chinyere Emmanuel Egbe
Department, University & Country	Medgar Evers College of the City University of New York, USA