

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122219
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF FARMER PRODUCER COMPANIES ON GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES: KNOWLEDGE, IMPLEMENTATION, AND BARRIERS
Type of the 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

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>I believe this article is relevant for the scientific community as it allows to understand some factor that may influence the adoption of different GAP practices, which are important for the protection of the environment. The author made a good introduction</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The content of this paper looks more at the state of gap among FCPs. I personally did not learn about the impact of FCPs on good agricultural practices.</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>	<p>I think this study is missing on the sample. The author should have chosen farmers in FCPS vs farmers not in FCPs on agricultural practices. Otherwise, the current analysis is focus on the state of gap among FCPs.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It ids appropriate. However, I think the modelling is light as the author just presented descriptive statistics not allowing to see the true impact of all factors when put together</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>	<p>Misleading Title and Scope of the Study</p> <p>One major issue with the paper is the title, which suggests an analysis of the impact of Farmer Cooperative Programs (FCPs) on agricultural practices. However, the current analysis does not allow for such an assessment. Instead, the authors have merely presented the state of GAP adoption among FCP participants, which does not provide insight into the actual impact of FCPs on these practices. If the intention was to evaluate the real impact of FCPs, the study should have included a control group of farmers who are not part of FCPs. This would enable a comparative analysis using matching techniques or endogenous regression methods to identify the causal impact of FCPs on GAP adoption. Without this comparison, the study's findings are incomplete and potentially misleading.</p> <p>Econometric Bias and the Need for a Robust Model</p> <p>The absence of a nuanced model could introduce econometric biases, particularly if key variables are omitted or improperly specified. For example, if the paper only uses simple descriptive statistics to claim that education influences the adoption of GAP practices, it fails to account for other correlated factors that might be driving the observed effect. Education could be correlated with several other variables, such as access to information, financial resources, or the likelihood of obtaining certification. Not including these factors in the same model can lead to omitted variable bias, where the effect of education is either overstated or understated.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Building an OLS Model at Least</p> <p>To provide a robust analysis, I advise building an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) model at a minimum that incorporates all relevant factors from the survey. This model should be specified for each type of GAP practice, allowing for a detailed examination of how different variables influence the adoption of specific practices. By doing so, the analysis would be able to isolate the effect of each factor, offering a clearer understanding of what drives adoption.</p> <p>For instance, if education and obtaining certification are both included in the model, it would be possible to see whether education has a direct impact on the adoption of GAP practices or whether its effect is mediated through the likelihood of obtaining certification. Without this level of specificity, the paper's conclusions could be misleading, as they might attribute the influence of one factor to another, simply because correlated variables were not properly accounted for.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>New methodologies such as matching methods should be used if the author is able to get data on farmers not part of FCPs.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:

Name:	Abdelmoumine Traore
Department, University & Country	USA