

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_85582
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of adopting Technological innovations on rice value chain actors in Cameroon.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT It is unconventional to begin a sentence with “In spite of its importance”. A more appropriate opening sentence should be adopted. Line 8- FCFA should be written in full.</p> <p>The research problem that instigated your study should be briefly elucidated in your abstract.</p> <p>The significance of the study should be incorporated in the abstract.</p> <p>Also, the adopted statistical software used for the analysis should be stated in the abstract.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY The adopted statistical software used for the analysis should be stated in the methodology.</p> <p>REFERENCES Your references are not alphabetically arranged and well aligned</p> <p>A subheading should be dedicated for study recommendations for policy makers, stakeholders and the reading public on how to better the lot of actors along the rice value chain as well as their selection of preferred technologies</p>	<p>We have adopted the comment of the reviewer. The sentence now reads: The outcomes of adopting technological innovations remain debatable in spite of its importance.</p> <p>This has been added in the abstract as recommended: The majority of agricultural technology adoption studies analyze adoption effects on a single actor, often neglecting other actors on the value chain. This limits knowledge of adoption rates and their effects on entire value chains.</p> <p>The relevance has been added as follows: Studying adoption choices and effects among multiple actors on the value chain can provide novel insights of scientific and policy relevance.</p> <p>This has been specified: Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25</p> <p>Done</p> <p>We checked previously published articles of AJAEES and the references were done/numbered AS THEY APPEAR IN THE ARTICLE. This explains why the references are not alphabetically arranged. We tried to align the references better (left alignment)</p> <p>We have added 2 sections in the concluding section on: ‘Research implications’ and ‘Policy implications’ respectively</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Rephrase the sentence “The rice value chain in Cameroon is overwhelmed characterized by multiple small-scaled actors” on page 1 for clarity.</p> <p>The title of Table 1- “<i>Table 1: Type of available innovations and actors involved</i>” is incomplete. Innovations and actors involved in what?</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for this particular comment: The sentence now reads:</p> <p>The rice value chain in Cameroon is characterized by multiple small-scaled actors who have different operational capacities and interests.</p> <p>Table 1 now reads: Type of available innovations and actors involved in the rice value chain</p>

Review Form 1.6

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>	<p>We are extremely grateful to the reviewer comments, which have significantly improved the quality of the paper</p> <p>Overall, grammatical issues and slight improvement in the Discussion have been made on the article (see version in track mode)</p>