Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_126190**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FACTORS INFLUENCE THE ADOPTION OF IMPROVED AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES AMONG SMALLHOLDER FARMERS IN THE RIPAT PROGRAM.**
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

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**It is of important to cultivate and add a literature on the issues under study as the agriculture supporters and actors lack enough knowledge base, real-time adoption of technical and practical changes to realize the desired outcomes and improvements. However, this manuscript presents less on the findings and suggestions compared to promises made at the introductory parts and problem statement, for instance, it promises to add the knowledge to the literature on how focused interventions might improve agriculture efficiency and food security, with possible implications for similar projects and programs in Tanzania and across East Africa region. But it ends up suggesting and recommending on the researched project itself to prioritize expanding its training programs. The author have to show how the results can be generalizable.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes, but adding the location would sound better**	
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.	**An abstract is not comprehensive enough. It presents effects on p-values describing significance levels instead of showing the extent or magnitude of effects of particular variables. It also confusing as it tells that TRAINING has positive significant effects on implementing intercropping while EDUCATION has no significant effect, yet it concludes by suggesting increase in training opportunities for the farmers with minimal education.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
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.	**The manuscript misses some aspects to assure its robustness. It acknowledges one of the major limitation of adopted research design as its the inability to establish causality between variables since data is collected at once, so promises to tackle this limitation by performing a strong statistical analysis to investigate correlations among variables and identify potential confounding factors, but the manuscript didn't show any statistical tests such as multicollinearity tests and the likes. It presents contradicting results and implications to the conclusion made, Referring to table 3, the results show that only household income has marginal effects on adoption of agricultural practices, the is additional income adds likelihood of adopting agricultural practices by 16.9%, which is well discussed, but training which is strongly positive significant (table 2) doesn't have significant marginal effect (table 3), unconvincingly the author comes to conclude that the project should prioritize expanding its training programs to encourage smallholder farmers to adopt improved agriculture practices. This earmarks that something technically is not well perfumed or addressed, otherwise there is some issues in the data set or the way the regressions were ran.**	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Yes, they are.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes, just minor grammatical improvements	
Optional/General comments	An author should have consistent presentation from an abstract, linking to methodology, results discussed and the conclusions to have the same direction and meaning of the findings.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Juma Ismail**
Department, University & Country	**University of Dodoma, Tanzania**