

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_85025
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Maize Yields among Small-Scale Farmers at Household Levels in Mbinga District, Tanzania
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I recommend the author that no need of writing the contents of the study at the end of introduction part.2. A critical view in this study is the survey data is about 2017 but the data analysis is about 2022. Hence, author need to check the source of table 1 and 2 and place it clearly.3. I am not clear that why author has used 'household level' in the title. The description and components of household level is not given clearly. If it is so, i recommend the author to modify the title of the study.	These are constructive comment for refining the paper.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract and keywords are clearly focused the expected outline of the topic.2. Author has gradually developed the introduction part of the study with the importance of agriculture, Statistics of Tanzania and further developed with the problems and objectives of the study.3. Given materials and methods is clearly stated with the agricultural background of the Tanzania and further it is constructed with sufficient information. Although, such a statistical tools given in the part is not placed in abstract of the study. But, it is not a major concern.4. The part of the results and discussion is mentioned the statistical design and discussion as well.5. Conclusion and recommendations of the study clearly reported the methodology and recommendations.	Comments taken and addressed accordingly

Review Form 1.6

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>	