

Review of: "Assessing the Role of Consumer Cooperatives in Improving Livelihood of the Members of Hawassa Zuria Woreda, Sidama Regional State, Ethiopia"

Ziade Hailu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study attempted to show the role of consumer cooperatives in improving members' livelihood. It might add some knowledge to our understanding using data from Ethiopia. And yet, there are several issues that need to be addressed if it is to be fit for publication.

Abstract

The abstract needs to show what the gap was in literature or in practice and show the results. One or two lines on methodology would suffice.

Introduction

The first line of the introduction says "Road construction is a vital infrastructural development activity that plays a significant role in". This lack of proofreading affects my motivation to read further and questions the seriousness of the authors.

Introduction lacks strong footing in the literature; for example, "...consumer cooperatives has not been extensively studied in the Ethiopian context"; Who said that? Your own assessment? Also, "was studied in other countries but not in Ethiopia" is not a strong justification.

The conclusion part in this section seems to be written by AI, and you appear to focus only on impacts and challenges. "Offers valuable insight" is a turn-off. Pls review this section one more time and anchor it to some existing works.

Methodology

The paper lacks a theory. What theory or combination of theories is guiding this study? Philosophical assumptions can't substitute for it. Also, that part is very generic and I suggest you remove.

Results

You may report descriptive statistics using the mean value, but recognize that some writers argue that Likert scale type questions can't be analyzed using the mean value because the variables are not continuous. I am not saying it is not done, but just explain the controversy. For me, I would suggest looking at agreement or disagreement level.

I am not sure if a paper presented at a descriptive level would attract much attention. What if a deeper analysis using inferential statistics guided by a theory is undertaken, where you have an opportunity to create new knowledge.

I don't see much use of the qualitative work you said you were using in this section.

Conclusion section

This section shows the highest level of sloppiness on the part of the authors. It is copied from a different study and included here.

“The study conducted on factors affecting employee motivation in the public sector found that salary, promotion, job satisfaction, recognition, and work conditions have a positive and statistically significant effect on employee motivation”

My views in general

- The authors have tried their best, but this can't be published unless the manuscript is subjected to major revision;
- There appears to be heavy use of AI-generated material which needs to be humanized.
- The authors showed limited anchoring to major literature, and their departure point is not clarified. There seems to be a poor imagination that they are writing this paper for an international audience. The testing ground for your theory (e.g., Ethiopia) has only limited relevancy. We are after research gaps and ideas, and testing them in Ethiopia has secondary relevance.
- I would suggest you move one more step from the publication of descriptive results to a higher level (e.g., regression) where you can make knowledge claims.
- The reviewer sees no subtlety nor nuance in this paper, values that are appreciated for international publications.
- With the level of sloppiness demonstrated, one fears not enough time was taken to conceptualize the study from the theoretical position.

Decision: MAJOR REVISION