

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_126973
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Gender Inclusion in Credit Utilization among Farmers in Ondo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This manuscript offers valuable insights into the relationship between kitchen layout design and individual work performance in eateries, contributing to our understanding of workplace ergonomics in the food service industry. Its focus on a specific regional setting in Davao del Norte, Philippines, adds context-specific data that may guide improvements in layout planning for similar eateries in other regions. By examining task, contextual, and counterproductive behaviors, this study highlights practical strategies for enhancing employee productivity through layout design, making it a meaningful addition to the fields of human resource management, ergonomics, and organizational behavior.</p> <p>Strengths and Weaknesses of the Manuscript</p> <p>This study's strength lies in its clear research design and comprehensive approach to measuring both layout effectiveness and work performance. The manuscript is structured and systematically addresses the research questions, although the literature review could benefit from a broader perspective that includes recent findings from similar studies. Expanding the discussion to compare findings with international data on kitchen ergonomics would strengthen its contribution. Additionally, the paper could improve its readability by refining certain sections for conciseness and clarity.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Kitchen Layout Design and Individual Work Performance of Eatery in Davao Del Norte, Philippines," accurately represents the study's focus but could be refined for conciseness. An alternative title suggestion is: "Impact of Kitchen Layout Design on Employee Performance in Eateries: A Case Study from Davao Del Norte, Philippines."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive, summarizing the objectives, methodology, and key findings of the study. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the theoretical framework, the study's implications for practice, and specific recommendations for future research. Adding these points would provide a fuller overview and highlight the study's relevance to both scholars and practitioners.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined sections that follow a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Subsections on methodology, results, and discussion are appropriately detailed, enabling readers to follow the research process and understand the findings. However, including a separate section for limitations and future research suggestions might further improve the structure.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4	The study appears scientifically robust, with a well-justified methodological approach and rigorous statistical analysis. The use of the Garrett Ranking Technique to evaluate the relationship between layout design and work performance is a suitable choice, providing both quantifiable and interpretable results. Furthermore, the study's application of the socio-technical systems theory strengthens its	

Review Form 3

sentences may be required for this part.	theoretical basis, adding depth to the analysis of how layout design impacts individual performance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally appropriate but could be enhanced by including more recent studies (within the last ten years) that address similar themes. Incorporating additional sources would reinforce the study's connection to ongoing research trends and help situate it within a broader scholarly discourse on workplace design and employee performance.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Logit Regression Showing the Factors Affecting Access to Credit adds value to manuscript	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudhanand Prasad Lal
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India