

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_129335
Title of the Manuscript:	Commercialization of smallholder producer’s farmers and its impacts with special reference to Ethiopia: A review
Type of the Article	Review 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.	The manuscript is very importance for the scientific community. It reviews the factors that influence commercialization of smallholders. It also reviews the impacts of commercialization on various economies, including Ethiopia. It as well looks at the prospects and challenges of commercializing smallholder farms, and draws conclusions and recommendations thereof. These are rigorous analysis and discussions for engaging the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. It should be: “Commercialization of smallholder farms in Ethiopia: <u>A review.</u> ”	
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 is too general. It does not pertain to Ethiopia in particular. The factors, impacts, challenges of commercializing smallholder farms, as presented in the abstract does not pertain to Ethiopia. The abstract does not draw any conclusions. It merely put literature together (literature from chapters one, two and three of the write up) as abstract. The conclusions and recommendations should be derived from the findings of the study, as discussed in chapter four of the paper. Yet, there are no concrete conclusions and recommendations in the abstract, relative to the study objectives. The abstract (write up) did not spell out the impact of commercialization of smallholder farms on Ethiopia. Hence, the need to modify the topic to suit the abstract/content of the paper.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, except there are technical and grammatical errors that need to be corrected, to make it suitable for the academic audience.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, except the in-text citation style lacked consistency. These have been corrected and highlighted yellow in the paper. The authors should do well to be consistent with their referencing style, by following the examples highlighted withing the text.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The authors should re-write the entire abstract to reflect the study objectives. Comments highlighted in red letters need authors’ attention and correction. Thos coloured yellow have already been corrected / suggested for the authors. The manuscript was reviewed in <i>track changes</i> . Authors can accept or reject the review comments/ suggestions and stop tracking.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
--	--------------------	---

Review Form 3

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? No.	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No. There are no competing interest issues in this manuscript.	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	Not applicable.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer: I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”
“I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	8/10

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	DR. CLEMENT YAW LAMPEY
Department of Reviewer	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION COMMUNICATION
University or Institution of Reviewer	UNIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, TAMALE
Country of Reviewer	GHANA, WEST AFRICA.
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	LECTURER
Email ID of Reviewer	CLEMENT.LAMPTEY@UDS.EDU.GH
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+233595811121
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	RURAL SOCIOLOGIST, INNOVATION COMMUNICATIONST, RESEARCHER, PUBLISHER, TEAM PLAYER, ADULT PSYCHOLOGIST