

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_94570
Title of the Manuscript:	Households' Agribusiness Status and Food Security in Burkina Faso
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This study focuses on food security and agribusiness status in the rural area of Burkina Faso – one of the typical low-income countries. Therefore, the research topic is primarily of high practical significance.</p> <p>I have some suggestions to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three economic theoretical perspective, neoclassical theory, allocative efficiency theory, and peasantry theory should be added by summarizing the main findings, both strengths and weaknesses/limitations of each theory into one table. - The author needs to present more specifically in introducing the main interesting points of the Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, simultaneously the author should also refer to Fig.1/Fig.2 in each introduction bellow: + “The following scheme summarises the conceptual framework that analyses the relationships between households’ agribusiness status and its determining factors: These factors can be organised around labour, capital, and socio-demographic characteristics.” + “The following conceptual scheme maps the relationships between the level of food security and explanatory variables regarding household agribusiness status:” - In “conclusion” section, the author needs to clearly confirm whether the hypothesis stated at the end of section 2.3 is true or false and to what extent. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sources (citations) are often used from other studies. Accordingly, if the figures 1 and 2 were created by the authors, they don't need to note “source”. - There are many places that need to be re-edited in English, especially the red words bellow, for examples: + “As the level of food security in agribusiness households is (two times) high as in non-agribusiness households, this study recognises the relevance of targeting agribusiness as an enabler for achieving food security.” + “Some responses are found in the theory of the AL of traditional family farming [11] and the peasantry economy theory [12] which are referred to in this study.” + “as [78] suggested, not all these methods are robust. [79] performed a comparative analysis of three methods (IVProbit, MLE-simple probit, and Rivers and Vuong’s method). He found that IVProbit, Rivers, and Vuong’s methods are less powerful than the simple probit method, and none of these three methods allows to determine the origin of endogeneity. [79] used the 3SLS estimation method to identify the origin of this endogeneity. Hence, this study uses the Rivers and Vuong method, IVProbit, 3SLS, and simple probit as the most robust tests. Table 6 (cf. the Appendix) summarises these estimates.” + “However, [15] recognises that these types of agriculture seek to manage natural risks better to maintain or improve their equilibrium at three levels: (i) the balance between resources and needs, (ii) the balance between people and nature, and (iii) the balance between humans themselves. In addition, while acknowledging the relevance of Chayanov’s model, [17] highlights its limitations by suggesting that it should be extended beyond nuclear households. Indeed, in real life, the model is not applicable to complex and dynamic household units [17]. “ + “Tables 9 and 10 (see the Appendix) indicate that a proportion of agribusiness and non-agribusiness households are food insecure.” + “The minimum and maximum MFSI scores were 0.1058 and 0.02405, respectively. On average, these households have a food security index of 0.2474, with a median of 0.02405. The latter means that 50% of non-agribusiness households have food security of less than 0.2405.” + “Hence, this study assumes that farmers who grow more crop types are more food-secure.” + “In addition, the share of the government budget supporting the agriculture and food sector has increased from US\$ 342.053.000 (19.16% of the total budget) in 2006 to US\$ 589.526.960 (16.94% of the total budget) in 2013, an increase of 64.3% in absolute value, but a decrease in relative value (19.16 to 16.94) [68]. An important reason why these family farms are not included in the growth process is that their farming practices continue to be extensive, rather than intensive [66. [69] identifies them by their lack (low level) of equipment and absence (low use) of inputs in their production process. This situation is exacerbated by natural resource degradation (land and forest products) which serves as the basis for farmers’ livelihoods [30].” + etc. 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	This is a meaningful and meticulous research work of the author. This study should be considered for publishing after serious editing by the author.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Tuyet-Anh
Department, University & Country	School of Science and the Environment, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada