

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_118226
Title of the Manuscript:	Influencing Drivers of Agricultural Production Technology of Rice in Burundi
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, it is important</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</b></p> <p>4. <b>No, the paper is quite weak. It lack the discussion of alternative and better analytical methods. It assumes many important points rather than empirically testing them. It assumes members and non-members of associations are similar. It talks about the counterfactual group without any effort to use or discuss propensity score matching or any other matching method. It assumes that the Average Treatment Effect can be estimated even though the observable characteristics of treated and untreated farmers may not be similar. It assumes that the Heckman is the appropriate model without empirically testing for other options such as the Cragg Double Hurdle and Tobit.</b></p> <p>5. <b>No</b></p> <p>6. <b>No, because no other methods are discussed</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	It needs improvement	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**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:	Benedito Cunguara
Department, University & Country	Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique