

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAEES_108049 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | 'Small-Scale Chicken Farmers' Use of Social Media to Access Market Information from Social Media in Arusha City, Tanzania |
| Type of the Article | |

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. The study lacks managerial implications and theoretical contributions, which are necessary for expanding the body of knowledge.</p> <p>2. The introduction mentions that studies on the use of social media for accessing market information among SSCFs in Tanzania are limited. It would be helpful to explicitly state the research gap and the novelty of this study in addressing it.</p> <p>3. The introduction mentions the research questions, but they are somewhat vague. Providing more specific and concise research questions can improve the clarity of the study's objective.</p> <p>Sufficient enough.</p> <p>The abstract should be more clearly structured. It should be concise, but it should also contain enough information to understand the study.</p> <p>Somewhat appropriate.</p> <p>Some fundamental issues on the paper:</p> <p>1. The study lacks of discussion; it merely presents the data and findings without proper analysis and comparisons with previous research.</p> <p>2. Instead of conducting descriptive analysis and regression analysis, the study would have been more meaningful if it had formulated hypotheses and tested them.</p> <p>3. The lack of clarification on the context of the study requires justification.</p> <p>4. The sources of the measurement scale used in the study were not mentioned. Please clarify the sources.</p> <p>5. The reference list in this paper is inconsistent, and it is suggested that it adhere to the reference style.</p> <p>1. There is no ground theory of the study and it needs to be supplemented.</p> <p>2. More citations from key papers in this context are needed.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>There are some grammatical issues and awkward phrasings in the paper that need revision for clarity and fluency. For example, "This study, therefore," could be rephrased for clarity. The sentence structure can be improved for better flow. The use of a professional proofreader is recommended.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

Review Form 1.7

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: | Patria Laksamana |
| Department, University & Country | Graduate School of Business, Perbanas Institute, Indonesia |