

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAAR_106926</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EMPOWERMENT OF THE SEKAR SARI PROCESSING GROUP IN PROCESSED STRAWBERRY PRODUCTS TO SUPPORT PANCASARI VILLAGE ECOTOURISM</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Based on the review, the manuscript appears to have some elements that could make it important to the scientific community, particularly in the context of rural development, agriculture and community empowerment.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title is concise and provides a clear indication of the article's focus.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract is not comprehensive enough. Most of the things said are supposed to be in the background. The abstract should be revised to include the purpose of the study, methods and key findings.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The article lacks clear subsections within sections, making it challenging to follow the flow of information. Breaking down the content into subsections would improve readability and comprehension.</b></li> <li>5. <b>As it stands, the manuscript does not fully meet the scientific correctness as some sections such as results were not provided and the discussion is also not comprehensive. There needs to be more expansion especially with the data presentation and discussion</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are okay</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Considering the fact that the writer is not a native speaker, the language is pardonable. However, there are minor grammatical errors and language issues throughout the article. A thorough proofreading and editing process are needed to improve the overall quality of the paper.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Introduction</b></li> <li>b. <b>Literature review</b></li> <li>c. <b>Methodology</b></li> <li>d. <b>Results and discussion</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>The introduction effectively introduces the topic of community empowerment and its relevance to Pancasari village. However, the introduction lacks a clear statement of the research problem making it less clear what the article aims to address. The author must clearly tell what exactly the problem is and want to address.</b></li> <li>b. <b>The literature review provides context and background information related to strawberry processing and its potential benefits. However, the literature review is relatively short and could be expanded to provide a more comprehensive overview of relevant studies and research.</b></li> <li>c. <b>The methodology section is lengthy and could benefit from a clearer organization, possibly through the use of subsections. Additionally, it lacks information on the selection criteria for participants in the community service activities. Also, it was written in a way that suggest that the study is yet to be conducted meanwhile it has already been done so the tenses to be used should be the past tense and not the future tense.</b></li> <li>d. <b>The article lacks specific data or results from the community service activities. The manuscript did not provide any results on the community service activities and this needs to be brought. Including quantitative or qualitative data on the impact of the training and empowerment efforts would strengthen this section and provide</b></li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p>e. Conclusion</p> <p>f. Citations and references</p> <p>g. Recommendation</p>	<p>evidence to support the claims made.</p> <p>e. The conclusion summarizes the main points of the article and reiterates the importance of community service activities. However, the conclusion could benefit from a clearer statement of the article's contributions and implications for future research or practice. This should be included.</p> <p>f. While the article contains some references, there are several statements that would benefit from additional citations to support claims and provide credibility to the research. Ensure that all claims are properly referenced.</p> <p>g. Based on the strengths and weaknesses identified, I would recommend that the author(s) revise and improve the article before considering it for publication. Specifically, the article should be revised to include more detailed data and results from the community service activities, provide clearer subsections for improved organization, and ensure proper citations and references. Additionally, a thorough proofreading and editing process is essential to address grammatical errors and language issues. Once these revisions are made, the article could be a valuable contribution to the field of community development and empowerment.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Jerome Nketsiah</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Foso College of Education, Ghana</b></p>