

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_100017
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing the Accessibility of Anchor Borrower's Programme Fund Among Rice Farmers in Ebonyi State, Nigeria
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)	1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) The theme that the manuscript deals with is important with the work of teachers who are not specialists in their subject or, as the article expresses it, outside their field. 2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) Yes, and in addition to a lot of interest as a topic 3. Is the abstract of the article complete? Complies with the abstract of an article, but the keywords of this article are missing 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Treat the topic correctly 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? I think that it would only be improved with a revision in its writing. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. No, the number of references complies with the review standard.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The topic is important, but the wording of the article must be corrected, since the phrases are repeated and this is due to the wording of the text. Review points and commas in the written text, they are paragraphs of more than 10 lines. The conclusions are relevant to the subject matter. It is suggested to review the form rather than the substance of the exposed	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Manuel Salum Tomé
Department, University & Country	Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile