

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3214
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges Faced by Strategic Partners in Driving Extension Programme: Lessons Learnt From Madzivhandila Agricultural College of Limpopo Province, South Africa
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers a detailed examination of strategic partnerships in agricultural education, offering valuable insights and practical guidance for enhancing agricultural education through strategic partnerships. The use of textual analysis as a methodology adds rigor to the research, bolstering the credibility of its findings. However, While the challenges faced by partnerships are identified, the discussion could delve deeper into the broader implications of these challenges for agricultural education and policy. It concludes with actionable recommendations aimed at improving collaboration between educational institutions and their partners, while also addressing the specific needs of smallholder farmers in Limpopo Province.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract for the study is not comprehensive. It outlines the study's purpose of clarifying the roles of strategic partners but lacks a clear statement on how these clarifications contribute to the college's objectives and the agricultural sector. The methodology mentions "textual analysis" without detailing its application or the specific texts analysed, which diminishes understanding. The discussion of stakeholder analysis is insufficient, lacking criteria for stakeholder selection and engagement processes. While the findings list numerous strategic partners, brief explanations of their roles would provide necessary context. Moreover, the conclusion suggests a "workable solution" but lacks specificity regarding these solutions and actionable recommendations for future research. To enhance clarity and impact, the abstract should define critical terms consistently, reduce redundancy, and connect findings to broader agricultural challenges in South Africa. Addressing these gaps would give a more precise overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and implications for Madzivhandila College and its strategic partnerships.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes , however, in giving a background, the article could be strengthened by a helicopter view of current policies underpinning PPPs in South Africa. This will give clarity on the operating environment.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, robust, and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach. Using textual analysis methodology to gather and synthesise data is a rigorous approach that enhances the validity of the findings and ensures that the conclusions drawn are based on solid evidence. By identifying key strategic partners and clarifying their roles, the manuscript provides a well-structured framework for understanding how these collaborations can address the needs of smallholder farmers. Including specific partners adds depth to the analysis, making it relevant for future research and practical applications. Furthermore, the emphasis on stakeholder analysis as a critical tool for assessing partnership dynamics underscores the technical rigor of the study.	

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references are insufficient; consider adding more references. There is a need for recent references, publications within 5 years. Seven out of the ten references are very old. The authors need to consider the latest research in the field coupled with best practices. A lot has been done between 2006 and 2024. Old data can be used to provide context or background for a specific model.</p>	
--	--	--

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript you provided contains valuable insights into strategic partnerships at Madzivhandila College of Agriculture, but it could benefit from several improvements in clarity, coherence, and academic rigor. Here are specific areas for improvement:</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Clarity and Conciseness: The abstract is somewhat verbose. Aim to summarize the main findings and objectives in a more concise manner. For instance, "This study examines the roles of strategic partners and the extension section at Madzivhandila College of Agriculture, identifying key intervention areas and proposing joint strategies for collaboration."</p> <p>General Language and Structure</p> <p>Formal Tone: Some phrases feel informal or conversational. Academic writing typically requires a more formal tone. For instance consider replacing "a lot" with "significantly" or "considerably."</p> <p>Complex Sentences: Some sentences are lengthy and complex, which can obscure meaning. Break these into shorter, clearer sentences. For instance, "The college itself does not have adequate facilities and lacks knowledge in some specialized areas." can be split: "The college lacks adequate facilities. It also lacks expertise in certain specialized areas."</p> <p>Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terminology (e.g., "Madzivhandila College of Agriculture" vs. "MCA"). Choose one form and stick with it throughout.</p> <p>Objectives: The objectives are clear but could be presented in a more structured manner. In using bullets, ensure consistency, either diamonds or the round dots throughout the document. Methodology: This section lacks detail on how textual analysis was specifically conducted. Please provide more detail on the criteria for selecting texts and how the analysis was structured. Observations and Discussion: This section contains valuable findings but can benefit from clearer headings and subheadings to guide the reader. For example, Use headings such as "Key Strategic Partners," "Roles and Responsibilities," and "Challenges Faced."</p> <p>References and Citations</p> <p>Ensure proper formatting and consistency in citations (e.g., dates, names). Use a consistent citation style (APA, MLA, etc.) throughout the manuscript. Some cited authors are not sufficiently integrated into the discussion. For instance, instead of just stating what an author argues, relate their findings to your own study.</p> <p>The conclusion summarizes findings but could more strongly tie back to the study's objectives. Consider clearly reiterating how the findings address each objective stated earlier. Ensure recommendations are actionable and specific. Specify who should implement recommendations and provide a timeline where applicable.</p> <p>Overall Flow</p> <p>Use transitional phrases between sections and ideas to enhance the flow of the manuscript. I suggest phrases like "In addition," "Furthermore," or "Moreover" can help connect thoughts.</p> <p>Formatting: Ensure uniform formatting for headings, subheadings, and bullet points. Consistent font sizes, styles, and spacing will enhance readability. By addressing these areas, the manuscript can improve in its suitability for academic or scholarly publication, enhancing clarity, coherence, and overall impact.</p>	
--	---	--

[Review Form 2](#)

Optional/General comments	The overall article is good particularly looking at ho partnerships are managed in government, lacking a clear guide or framework to ensure that its deliverables are realised.	
----------------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nokonwaba Andiswa Gcume
Department, University & Country	Rhodes Business School, South Africa