

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_128088
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Attitude of Entrepreneurs towards Agri-Business in Tamil nadu using a Standardized Measurement Scale
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study holds practical significance for the agricultural sector by highlighting the need to foster a positive entrepreneurial attitude through targeted support systems, resource pooling, and motivational strategies. It underscores that resilience and prior farming experience enhance agri-business success, even in the face of risks like seasonal fluctuations. By validating an attitude scale, the research provides policymakers and stakeholders with a tool to assess and improve entrepreneurial disposition, thus contributing to the growth and sustainability of agri-business enterprises.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract should include a part of methodology, like no.of respondents, scale used, etc.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Manuscript is scientifically correct. But, the methodology should be more detailed. It should have an elaborate explanation of what are the respective values scores that been assigned. For example. MUF=1 or MUF=5. What is Q value, S value, how it is being calculated; all these have to be included in the methodology. But, to validate the results and discussion, relevant previous research works should have been referred and cited.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some more related research works could be referred to make it more validatory scientifically. I have mentioned a few for convenience from my knowledge. [The Entrepreneurial Event by Shapero & Sokol (1982), Entrepreneurial Potential and Potential Entrepreneurs by Krueger & Brazeal (1994), Agricultural Entrepreneurship: A Focus on Resilience and Resource Management by Jumani (2017), Risk Management and Innovation in Agricultural Entrepreneurship by Vesala et al. (2007).]	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sampriti Guha
Department, University & Country	Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India