

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_101523
Title of the Manuscript:	Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Farmer Producer Organization members: An empirical investigation
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**

	<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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Farmer Producer Organization members: An empirical investigation</b></p> <p><b>1. General comments</b></p> <p>a) The study raised a number of important issues through the assessment of entrepreneurial behavior of the members of the Farmer Producer organizations.</p> <p>b) While the abstract is clear and concise, the first few lines of the abstract did not bring out the problem that the prompted the author to assess the entrepreneurial behavior of the members. However, the author decided to bring out the problem in the introduction section. I suggest one or two sentences outlining the problem suffice.</p> <p>c) The Methodology section states the methodological choices chosen by the author; however, there are opportunities for the author to justify his/her methodological choices.</p> <p>d) Results and Discussion section;</p> <p>(i) 3.1 stated the results and an explanation to it but there were no current reference to the discussion except the mention of the study by Raji (16). Even though Raji was mentioned, the researcher did not show the relevance of that study in relation to his/her current study.</p> <p>(ii) Similarly, even though sections 3.2 and 3.3 contains the author's findings and thoughts, the discussion did not reference other relevant authors.</p> <p>(iii) On 3.4, the citation of Amareliya is in error because the author erroneously associated the study by Amareliya with entrepreneurial behavior of vegetable seed producing farmers, yet the study is about dairy farmers.</p> <p>e) All the sub sections in the results and discussion section lack the relevant references. Again, most of the references are Master's Thesis and little and no current scholarly articles and journals from reputable publishers were cited.</p> <p>f) Table 1 shows low, medium and high continuum scale, in this case readers may struggle to understand why the scale changed from the continuum of 1 to 5 scale outlined in the methodology section to low, medium, high scale in the presentation of results.</p> <p>g) The conclusion is good.</p> <p><b>2. Track changes in the manuscript.</b> See the comments on the manuscript well.</p> <p><b>3. Result</b></p> <p>The paper can be published after corrections have been made.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Tonderai Mathende</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Zimbabwe</b>