



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_40448
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF ACCESS TO FORMAL CREDIT AND PERFORMANCE OF SMALLHOLDER FARMERS: EVIDENCE FROM KUMBA MUNICIPALITY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	- Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 are misinterpreted. - In Table 3.1, the comas (representing decimals in French) should be replaced by dot (representing decimals in English).	The questions were asked in the negative (no access to credit) but caption in the positive. The label of table 4.1 is supposed to be no access to credit rather than access to credit. Same with table 4.2 and 4.3. However, the tables have been adjusted by maintaining the caption but reversing the responses. The comas on table 3.1 have been replaced with decimals
Minor REVISION comments	- The abstract should be reduced to 100-200 words. - The paper still contains some grammatical errors. - The author(s) misquoted Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) in page 4. - Elsevier (2016) is cited in the text but does not appear in the bibliography. - Tables should be numbered from 1, 2, 3, ... - The hypotheses evoked in the discussion were not formulated earlier in the paper. - The bibliography should be presented according to the standards set by the Journal.	Thorough review. Very good observations. The corrections have been done accordingly.
Optional/General comments	- There is potential in this research but it has to be edited to meet publication standards.	