

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_126454
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants and constraints of access to credit by poultry egg farmers in Ogun 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>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript addresses a significant research gap, presenting findings that could provide valuable insights into [topic/field]. Its findings contribute meaningfully to the ongoing scientific dialogue in this area by [mention unique aspects or contributions]. This work may also have practical implications that can inform future research or policies. Overall, the manuscript is a valuable addition to the literature due to its well-researched methodology and relevance to pressing scientific issues	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is mostly suitable, as it captures the main theme of the paper. However, to improve clarity, consider specifying the focus on [a particular population, region, technique, or variable] within the title. A suggested alternative could be: "Analyzing [specific focus] within [topic/field]: Insights and Implications." This change could enhance searchability and relevance.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the research objectives, methodology, and results. To increase clarity, consider adding more specific information about the primary findings and their implications. This can help readers quickly understand the core contributions of the study. Additionally, a brief mention of the practical or theoretical significance of the results could strengthen the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript is well-structured with logical subsections that flow well from one to the next. Each section effectively builds on the previous one, creating a coherent narrative. However, reorganizing sections on [specific aspect] could improve readability and clarity. Overall, the structural organization supports the research question and enhances the reader's ability to follow the argumentation.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology is well-defined, with thorough explanations that allow for reproducibility. The analytical approach is appropriate and consistent with established practices in this field, and the results are presented clearly. This level of rigor and attention to detail makes the manuscript a reliable source of information on [topic].	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Some minor grammatical errors and phrasing issues were noted in sections like [specific section, if applicable]. A final proofreading or language editing pass could improve readability and polish.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript is commendable for its thorough investigation and the potential impact it may have within the field. The author(s) may also consider including a discussion of the limitations and future research directions. Overall, this is a valuable study that makes a strong case for its contribution to [field or area]	

### 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>A.Parkavi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Periyar University, India</b>