

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_120279
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Good Post-Harvest Practices and Barriers among Cocoa Farmers and Licensed Buying Agents in Southwest, Nigeria
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://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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in our understanding of cocoa farming. The rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis presented provide valuable insights that can inform future research and policy decisions. I particularly appreciate this manuscript for its clear articulation of complex concepts and its potential to drive innovation and improvements in this area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is very good and suitable	
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 very comprehensive and included all the points very well	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its meticulous experimental design and adherence to established protocols. The authors provide detailed descriptions of their methods, ensuring reproducibility and transparency. The statistical analyses are robust and appropriately applied, lending credibility to the findings. Furthermore, the manuscript's thorough review of existing literature situates the study within the broader context of the field, highlighting its technical soundness and relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Reference is good in numbers and appropriate	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is no problem regarding the language	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

Review Form 3

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:	Dharmender Singh
Department, University & Country	Sanskaram University, India