

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_120849</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Agricultural Policy Reforms and Their Effects on Smallholder Farmers: A Comprehensive Review</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important to the scientific community, especially the agriculture sector on the various economic, financial, and development policies that have defined and refined the agriculture sector. It tackles how reform policies have affected smallholder farmers' livelihood and challenges and recommends policies that will enhance the resilience and productivity of smallholder farmer communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic is suitable for the article	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive. It mentioned the article's aim and issues such as challenges smallholder farmers have faced, how reform policies affected smallholder farmers, and policies from different countries and regions. It covered everything in the main article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate however, the information lacked references and it wasn't very detailed. The structure of the manuscript is not appropriate according to the general guidelines of the journal. The author did not follow the required general author's guidelines.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article informs financial agencies on how certain economic reforms and policies have challenged and disadvantaged smallholder farmers who are the major producers of most foods consumed across the globe. This historical review will aid stakeholders in making informed policies to support smallholder farmers with free inputs, access to capital, and land tenure security among others to boost the agriculture sector.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Although this is a historical review, most of the references are old. Most current literature has covered this topic and many more related ones hence, current references are available.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author did not follow the general guidelines of the journal. The subheadings were not numbered at all. The author did not mention the methods used in selecting literature for the review. There were no materials, methods, discussions, or results as required by the author.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dorcas Twumwaa Gyan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Southern University and A&amp;M College, United States</b>