

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_125187
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Contribution of Vegetable Gardening to Enhancing Household Income: A Case Study of Tabora Municipality, Tanzania
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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>	<p>Overall, this research touched on the issue of food insecurity, which is a growing public health concern. In addition, a mixed-method study would indeed provide valuable insights. Growing crops for food has been a recommended coping strategy, and its benefits have been highlighted during the COVID-19 pandemic. Research investigating the relationship between crop and income would benefit the community.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suitable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract talked about "incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods". Perhaps use the accurate mixed method terminology for this study design. For example, "this study employed a convergent parallel mixed method study design to" 2. The abstract talked about "Qualitative data were gathered through focus group discussions and key informant interviews." Perhaps a sentence or two about saturation and triangulation of data would improve the abstract. However, this is optional, depending on the word limitation for the abstract. <p>Overall, it is an acceptable abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understandably the objective of this study was placed in the introduction. However, clarity on the objective could be improved. Perhaps restructuring the paragraph with the general objectives followed by the specific objective. The general objective is unclear to readers. Perhaps a sub-heading for objectives would improve the clarity. If authors decide to include subheadings, please include which ones are for the qualitative and which are for the quantitative methods. 2. Perhaps separate Results from Discussion. This is elaborated in my comments in the following column. <p>Overall acceptable</p>	
<p>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 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the conceptual framework. Indeed, the framework was a derived one. However, being a mixed method study, perhaps the framework should be adapted to illustrate which variables were determined by the quantitative method of study and which were explored by the qualitative part. It would also be advisable to illustrate where the two methods converge or whether they were done sequentially. If in sequence, which method came first? A reader would understand the framework used for a quantitative design best suited by a path analysis or multilevel method instead of a mixed method. Therefore, the authors have to be careful how to "adapt" the framework for their use. 2. In research design, sampling procedure, sample size The 1st paragraph requires attention to improve clarity. A cross-sectional study design describes at what point in time the research was conducted. However, the authors continued in the following sentence, talking about the stages of the sampling procedure. Perhaps rewording, rephrasing or restructuring the paragraph would improve clarity for readers. Otherwise, some may be confused about the design and procedure when intending to replicate or reproduce this study. 3. Sample size determination requires clarification. How was the sampling population of 900 determined? Perhaps one simple sentence to explain this can improve clarity. 4. In section 3.3, more elaboration on the mixed method is required. This level of explanation is not acceptable. Readers would ask <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What design is this so-called "qualitative and quantitative data collection methods" as described in the abstract? 	

Review Form 3

	<p>b. Was there a merging of qualitative and quantitative “data” during analysis? (Noted that it was written that “The qualitative findings are integrated into the results and discussion section underneath.”. However, this is not sufficient.)</p> <p>c. Was there triangulation of data to ensure validated/robust/credible findings?</p> <p>5. The results and discussion section requires improvement. From the manuscript, it is difficult for readers to ascertain the results and the discussions. Perhaps separate the results from the discussion, for example. “The demographic analysis of vegetable growers in Tabora Municipality revealed that a significant majority, 64.2%, were male, while 35.8% were female (Table 1). This disparity indicates a higher male participation in vegetable gardening, aligning with the findings of [29], which suggested that men tend to be more engaged in vegetable production and related value chains than their female counterparts.” Understandably so, but discussion means that the author must also explain why their findings are similar instead of stating the facts from their results. Perhaps in the region of study, the women are caregivers at home? Or are the women employed in less laborious work? Separating the two sections could allow the authors to discuss the results in more detail. If the authors are not able to separate the two sections, a better discussion is still required.</p> <p>6. As already mentioned above, the authors must improve clarity in the objectives, the methods for mixed method design and how the data is used. This is reflected in the poorly structured results + discussion. Why is the qualitative data used for this study? Does it improve the understanding? Does it strengthen the quantitative data or vice versa? Was there a gap in findings if qualitative data was not used?</p> <p>Scientifically incorrect and technically unsound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Acceptable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Corrections required.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yeo Zi Sheng</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Malaysia</p>