

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_115689
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Market Participation among Smallholder Common Bean Farmers in Eswatini (Former Swaziland)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>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) Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the crucial issue of promoting market participation among smallholder common bean farmers in Eswatini, offering insights into determinants and recommendations for enhancing agricultural commercialization and rural livelihoods.</p> <p>2) yes it is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus and scope of the study. However, if a shorter title is desired, you could consider "Market Participation Determinants of Common Bean Farmers in Eswatini".</p> <p>3) Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including its purpose, objectives, research method, findings, recommendations, and the originality/value of the research. It effectively summarizes the key points of the manuscript, giving readers a clear understanding of the study's significance and contributions to the field.</p> <p>4) The manuscript follows a logical structure with subsections that align well with the content. The paper has sections such as Purpose, Objectives, Research Method, Findings, Recommendation, and Originality/Value, which indicate a clear structure.</p> <p>5) From the manuscript and the data and analysis contained within it, I can make definitive judgment on the scientific correctness of the study. The methodology appears to be appropriate for addressing the research objectives, including the use of secondary data, descriptive statistics, and the Heckman two-stage selection model for analysis. The findings and recommendations also seem to align logically with the research objectives. Further, thorough review of the complete study, including the methodology, data analysis, results, and discussion shows the quality of the work.</p> <p>6) references made were adequate</p> <p>7) nothing much</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>the language and English quality appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The abstract is well-structured, and the language used is clear and concise</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall good article</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:	Rajeshwari D
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Engineering, India