SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJEMT_30171**
Title of the Manuscript:	**WOMEN'S PERSPECTIVE ON ORGANIZATION AND THE ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF INCOME IN AGRICULTURE**
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)

SDI 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	**PART I: TITLE** 1. The title misses study area (Country and a study area). 2. Title formulation lacks specificity and scope. • How can organisation and alternative income generating activities 3. A case of (study area). **PART II: ABSTRACT** 1. The abstract misses the following: - The study problem thrust - Study objective (s) - Research design - Sampling procedures - Sample size justification - Data collection methods - Data analysis procedures - Synthesized/Key Conclusions - Recommendations 2. The keywords are missing. **PART III: INTRODUCTION** 1. The introduction lacks good flow as it fails to bring the reader to the exactly thrust of the study. However the introduction lacks strong back up from the existing body of literature. Also the introduction part has not explicitly spelled out the problem on hand. The introduction part misses study specific objectives which were intended to be addressed. The following observations are:- Line 23 Needs supportive literature Line 30 Improper citation Line 42 Needs supportive literature	

	Line 45 Improperly written i.e Northwestern??East?? Line 57 Needs supportive literature Line 55 Needs more elaborative statistics to justify the potential comparison Compare against something…. Line 66 What are the key arguments from other authors which spells out clearly and hence be in the position to argue the study is next to none. Finally the introduction lacks clear problem statement and their objectives i.e What was actually addressed by the study. **Ethical Issues:** Are there any related agencies to be acknowledged? (Agencies involved in funding like SIDA should be well acknowledged for a specific support, also the ones which availed permits, any kind of support in the pursuit of this work?) I think it is ethical to acknowledge everyone who took place in the pursuit of this work. **Plagiarism issue:** Plagiarism is not evident but the real ownership of the work is lacking	

Minor REVISION comments	**PART IV: MATERIALS&METHODS** **(I think this part should be Research Methodology since there are no materials # it is not experiment it's a survey)** Line 73 Lacks focus Line 75 Incorrect tense • Questionnaire is not an activity it's is a tool not it is administered through a survey. • How many villages, (Criteria of selection of villages) Line 93 More justification on the research design Line 103 Why Logit model? Any justification of using Logit? Any supportive literature? Generally the study methodology is not clear. (a reader cannot grasp the total way travelled towards arriving to the reported results) **PART IV: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** 1. The scientific interpretation and discussion of the study findings are missing in this section. 2. Majority of the study findings are not making sense Line 110 doesn't make sense i.e 76.6% are primary school graduates or dropouts?????? Double barrelled thrust 3. Most of the study findings presented in this paper lack thorough interpretations including those presented in the Line 122 onwards. 4. The implication of the study findings should be thoroughly drawn from discussion. 5. The implication of the revealed study findings should be presented in line with the discussion of the relevant related literatures. 6. There are should be a thorough discussion on every revealed findings.-→Try to make sense out of every revealed finding. 7. Line 163 holds contradicting thought since Logit model bases on P-values and significances which are needed to be well presented and demonstrated. ➢ **This should be applied to the almost every finding presented in this part.** **PART V: CONCLUSION** 1. This part should conclude the key findings only. 2. Do not conclude matters which are not justified by the empirical data.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Do not report findings in this section. **PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATION** • A sound scientific work should influence the existing social, economic, legal, policy and institutional actors. • There should be well sieved implications from the empirical findings which are to be endorsed by the study to improve/control the revealed situation in the study area. • This shows input/connection of your study with the real life.	
Optional/General comments	1. Update your literature to attain novelty of your work i.e Why relying on Özgen, 1995???? 2. Improve the grammar (I think there were no proofreading at all i.e *In this study has ben supported by the World Bank and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)???* 3. The depth of the analysis is not sufficient to fill the study gap 4. The study need more theoretical back up. Justification of the variables used in the Logit analysis i.e why using age, whether they have their own income, educational background, their desire to generate alternative income and whether dairy cattle raising activities are available in the facility?????	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Avit A. Chami***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Economic Studies, The Mwalimu Nyerere Memorial Academy, Tanzania***