

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_96833 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Analysis of the cassava value chain in reference to smalholder farmers in Busia County, Kenya |
| 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>)

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 scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | The topic of the research is practical and contemporary The abstract is adequate, it represents the paper in its parts. The Keywords are good The introduction and background are appropriately clear and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated them to support the subject. Within the introduction, the literature review is adequate, relevant, streamlined, and very sufficient to support the research objective. Plus supported with relevant and updated references. The Methodology representation is clear. However, it needs some more info [see suggestion] Results are clearly represented in Tables and are sufficient to support the discussion. But Figure 1 is missing from the text?? Add it... Discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. Furthermore, it is validated with relevant citations. The conclusion is clear. Recommendations reported are fine References Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, completeness, and match with journal requirements... Proofreading and editing is needed [See attached corrected Manuscript] | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| 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: | Hussin Jose Hejase |
| Department, University & Country | Al Maaref University, Lebanon |