

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_115140
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTRANEIOUS SHOCKS AFFECTING AGRIBUSINESS LOANS DEFAULT RATE IN AGRICULTURAL FINANCE CORPORATION, MOUNT KENYA REGION
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important. The manuscript investigates the impact of extraneous shocks on the default rates of agribusiness loans in the Mount Kenya region, revealing that agroclimatic extremes and market volatility significantly contribute to higher default rates. Through a detailed study involving 300 borrowers from the Agricultural Finance Corporation, it finds that these shocks account for nearly 24% of the default rate variance. The research underscores the importance of strategic interventions, such as tailored insurance schemes and risk management practices, to mitigate these impacts, offering valuable insights for policymaking in agricultural finance and risk management. 2. Yes, the title is suitable "Extraneous Shocks Affecting Agribusiness Loans Default Rate in Agricultural Finance Corporation Mount Kenya Region" describes the study's focus on how external factors influence agribusiness loan defaults in a specific area. A more concise alternative could be "Impact of External Shocks on Agribusiness Loan Defaults in Mount Kenya," which retains the original title's key elements in a shorter form. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, covering the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. It clearly outlines the investigation into how extraneous shocks, such as agroclimatic extremes and market volatility, influence the default rates of agribusiness loans in the Mount Kenya region. The study's significance is highlighted by its potential to inform credit stakeholders about interventionist policies and risk management strategies. However, the abstract could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the statistical significance of the findings and perhaps providing a more direct statement about the study's contribution to the existing body of knowledge in agricultural finance. 4. The manuscript's structure, with sections on the Abstract, Introduction, Research Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, follows a conventional and appropriate format for scientific research. Each section serves a distinct purpose, from introducing the problem and methodology to presenting findings and concluding with implications and recommendations. <p>However, some areas could potentially benefit from further refinement for clarity and depth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction: It might be enhanced by providing more context on the significance of agribusiness in the Mount Kenya region and a clearer statement of the research gap the study aims to fill. • Research Methodology: This section appears well-detailed, but it could be improved by adding more information on the selection criteria for the study area and the rationale behind choosing specific extraneous shocks for analysis. • Results and Discussion: While comprehensive, this section could be more impactful by integrating the results more tightly with existing literature, thereby strengthening the discussion on how the findings align or differ from previous studies. • Conclusion: The conclusions drawn are in line with the study's findings; however, this section could be expanded to discuss the broader implications of the research, potential limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research. <p><i>Overall, while the structure is appropriate, these refinements could enhance the manuscript's clarity, depth, and contribution to the field.</i></p> <p>5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound based on the methodology and analytical tools</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>described, such as SPSS and regression models. 6. yes references are recent.</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 of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication, presenting research in a structured and coherent manner.</p> <p>A thorough language review could further enhance the manuscript by refining complex sentences and ensuring clarity and consistency, particularly beneficial in sections like the Abstract, Introduction, and Conclusion. Addressing these aspects, especially in key sections located at the beginning and end of the document, will elevate the manuscript's readability and professionalism for academic audiences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a valuable exploration into how extraneous shocks affect agribusiness loan default rates in the Mount Kenya region, a topic of significant relevance to agricultural finance and risk management. However, to strengthen the manuscript further, it may benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced Clarity and Conciseness: Simplifying complex sentences and ensuring that all technical terms are clearly defined could make the manuscript more accessible to a broader audience, including those less familiar with the specific nuances of agricultural finance. • Updated and Comprehensive Literature Review: Incorporating recent studies could provide a more current context, particularly in rapidly evolving fields like climate impact on agriculture and financial risk management. • 3.Language and Grammar Review* A meticulous review of language and grammar could polish the manuscript, enhancing its scholarly tone and ensuring it meets the high standards of academic publishing. • 4.Detailed Discussion on Implications: Expanding the discussion to connect the findings more explicitly with practical implications for policymakers, financial institutions, and farmers could increase the manuscript's impact. • Consideration of Limitations and Future Research: Clearly articulating any limitations of the study and suggesting avenues for future research could provide valuable context for readers and guide subsequent investigations in the field. <p>Addressing these points could enhance the manuscript's contribution to the literature, ensuring it offers clear, actionable insights for both academics and practitioners in the field of agricultural finance and risk management.</p> <p>This rating reflects the manuscript's strong methodological approach and its relevance to the field of agricultural finance and risk management. However, considerations for improvement in areas such as clarity, conciseness, up-to-date literature, and a thorough language review suggest there is room for enhancement to reach the highest standards of academic publishing.</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:	Cecilie N Jona
Department, University & Country	University of Namibia, Namibia