

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104283
Title of the Manuscript:	Motivational Factors of Learners for Enrolling in Organic Farming Certificate Course through Open and Distance Learning Mode
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important in the scientific community. It will contribute a lot to academia in understanding motivational factors for enrolment.</p> <p>Yes the title is good.</p> <p>The abstract is good but it needs to be specific about the aim that it is to assess the motivational factors....as indicated in the text. It would be good to have a clear conclusion comparing each of these factors indicating which had the greatest influence (as supported by statistical figures) and a statement of recommendation</p> <p>The subsections are fairly structured.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes they are.</p> <p>The methodology section may need to be improved so that there is consistency in what is presented in the abstract and in the main document.</p> <p>For example, the interviews and telephone calls do not appear in the abstract. "Using quantitative research approach, a structured survey questionnaire was employed to intercept the motivational.."</p> <p>The abstract describes the quantitative survey. So the researcher needs to be clear if they carried out a Mixed research methods approach or a quantitative survey.</p> <p>However the format of the data presented seems to be inclined to quantitative study. So I suggest that the researcher leaves out the qualitative elements so that the study is consistent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language is scholarly	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Constance Chifamba
Department, University & Country	Solusi University, Zimbabwe