Review of: "Factors Influencing Smallholder Farmers' Preference for Veterinary Services Providers in Zimbabwe"

Felister Tibamanya[1]

1 Mzumbe University

REVIEW ON FACTORS INFLUENCING SMALLHOLDER FARMERS' PREFERENCE FOR VETERINARY SERVICES PROVIDERS IN ZIMBABWE

19 JULY 2023

Overall comment is that the authors have written the interesting topic in the field of agriculture particularly livestock farming. However, there are some improvements need to be made for their manuscript to be full adequately for publication.

1.INTRODUCTION

Comment 1: the entire first and second paragraphs is missing the evidences of literature to support the arguments in all lines. Actually the introduction need to use most updated literature particularly of years from 2018 up to 2023.

Comment 2: "However, there is a dearth of empirical studies that systematically examine the factors influencing smallholder farmers' decision-making process when selecting a preferred veterinary service provider". The authors need to indicate what are these studies in citations and references.

Comment 3: The authors also need to include the updated literature in clearly identify the

specific gap of their research. They have just highlighted the general gap of the study that "his study aims to address this research gap by comprehensively analyzing the factors that influence smallholder farmers' preference for veterinary service providers in Zimbabwe."

4. MATERIAL AND METHODS

STUDY AREA

Comment 1: The study area in first paragraph is missing the citations to support the statements from line 1 up to line 4.

SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Comment 1: I expected the author to have written the study applied a multi-stage sampling. Then later one go to specific stages they have undergone to do selection at district level (purpose sampling), village level (purposive sampling) and the selection of smallholder livestock farmers (stratified random sampling). The authors also need to offer the reasons for using such kind of sampling techniques in each stage.

General comments; The methods and data is missing the table of variables which also show their measurements.

5. RESULTS

Comment 1: the results of multivariate probit model should be presented own drawn table instead of state output table. The variable name should be well presented in full names. The study need clear interpretations as per used model.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Comment 1: The authors have not adequately discuss the findings. The discussion needs to include the relevant finding, what does the findings indicates, why the findings are important. It should then include the comparison of findings with previous studies in terms of similar findings and contradicting findings, and the limitations of the findings.

Comment 2: The conclusion should be clearly written without ignoring the suggested area for further studies considering the limitations of the study. The policy implications need to reflect the most significant findings of the study.

GENERAL FINAL COMMENTS: The manuscripts need to be further improved considering the proposed comments for the next stages of publication process. Thus, major corrections are needed based on the proposed comments. The manuscript requires proofreading to improve the quality of language. (stratified random sampling)

Thanks. Best wishes.