

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125889
Title of the Manuscript:	Participation and Challenges of Agreprenuers in Agribusiness Ventures
Type of the Article	original

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>

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>
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.	The manuscript has a meaning, I like it. I prefer to support it with a strong recommendation of revising it deeply....	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good however it can be slightly improved to catch key aspect of the study My suggestion: Participation and Challenges of Rural Youth in Agribusiness Ventures: A Case Study of Agriprenuers in Haryana, or Experience of Rural Youth in Agribusiness Ventures: A Case Study of Agriprenuers in Haryana	
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.	It needs revision; however, this comes better after reviewing/revising all other sections	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Manuscripts have almost similar subsections all over the world...	
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>Methodology; how does the study area differs from other regarding the selection criteria The sample needs to reflect a scientific method, in qualitative studies, usually samples are calculated, please check what you need to do compared to the situation in place The data collection tool needs more than what is given, try to read other studies and see how tools are selected/constructed Data collection process; needs to be described as well as data collectors, ethics involved etc....</p> <p>Results The whole section of presenting the results need a strong revision in terms of restructuring Can this study with describing the characteristics of the participants-what are their characteristics then? What are the variables to explain the participation, what the variables to explain the challenges etc.... What main component of this section: participation, challenges, experience, motivation, involved activities etc.... Frankly speaking, the manuscript has a lot of information which can be used to give good and well-structured paper, kindly strategies to revise and improve</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>The references are not sufficient, the information is not sufficient please revise with tendency of extending the content. Increase the robustness, show sufficient, concise information within the introduction, show figures as of youth in agriculture, try to compare in space(developed and developing countries, recent times verses previous times etc...</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not minor revisions, I find them major by looking at the methodology and the findings: The study should show the objectives and then align everything (methods and mostly the findings with objectives)</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>It is very important to take another look at the methodology as one most important section of the manuscript The findings and discussion needs strong revision, this can be in a different way to increase the flow of ideas and strengths of the study</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <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></p>
<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:	Sunday Francois Xavier
Department, University & Country	University of Rwanda, Rwanda