

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122827
Title of the Manuscript:	EXAMINING THE PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS OF MAIZE VALUE CHAIN PARTNERS
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>This manuscript provides useful insights into profile characteristics (information seeking behaviour, creative potential, quality consciousness, economic motivation, innovativeness, risk taking ability, and achievement motivation) of critical stakeholders in the maize value chain. The profile characteristics could enhance a reader's understanding of how and why stakeholders in a value chain may behave or make decisions. When these characteristics are known, it becomes possible to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a value chain. Also, the findings could be useful in enhancing existing policies that target value chains of agricultural commodities.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The manuscript is profiling the characteristics of the maize value chain partners (farmers and other stakeholders). It is a suitable title.</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>The abstract presented is not comprehensive enough. An abstract should, albeit briefly but concisely, incorporate information from all sections of the manuscript for the reader to get an overview of the study. As it is, the current abstract is not sufficient. The last sentence appears to be incomplete and there is no conclusion provided.</p> <p>My suggestion is that the abstract should be written to its completeness by incorporating the missing sections of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</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>The manuscript is technically good as it gives insights into some profiles of farmers and some critical partners along the maize value chain. However, it is not scientifically robust enough.</p> <p>The methodology section is not adequate. It does not explain the sampling or data analysis approaches/techniques used in the study. This leaves the reader with many unanswered questions (e.g., How was a sample size of 160 [farmers] and 80 [stakeholders] arrived at? Was the sampling random or purposive? Etc.).</p> <p>While the manuscript is adding to already existing body of knowledge on value chain studies, the manuscript does not make any reference to previous or similar studies on the subject matter to support some of the assertions or statements made in discussing the results of the present study. Supporting one's discussion with relevant references makes for a stronger argument.</p> <p>Regarding the presentation of the results, while results for farmers is standalone, the results for the "other stakeholders" is aggregated. This is good to give an overall picture, but it does not give an actual picture of individual stakeholder groups in the study (i.e., aggregators/traders, processors, and consumers). For clearer understanding of the profile characteristics examined, especially among the different "other stakeholder" groups, it would good to disaggregate the "other stakeholder" group into separate categories.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are neither sufficient nor recent. Only two (2) references are provided, which are classical references in the field. However, the authors should have broadened their literature review on the study topic to get more recent references related to their study.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The authors should consider addressing the comments in the “ scientific correctness ” section of Part 1.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfred Alumai
Department, University & Country	Muni University, Uganda