

[Review Form2](#)

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 vision looks nice. But The manuscript is not properly structures, During any such business process and strategy the top factors what required to address if they have a clear guideline of expectations of hypothesis and objectives	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Too lengthy but short Showcase "Lessons Learnt From Madzivhandila Agricultural College of Limpopo Province, South Africa" as scope not in title	
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.	Below points should be part of it as it's related to collaborative business and support functions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Process and performance parameters • Delivery KPIs (measure) • Flow of process • Top factors or problem areas which has impact on total business engagement • Conflict of Interest / positional power • Bias of taking action 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Mentioned above	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Objective 2. Clear impactable issues which are dependant factor 3. Independent factors of causal factors which need to be tested 4. Hypothesis 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	As mentioned above, the author needs to go through more manuscripts to structure it better and more literature review.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	If above improve the rest will also improve	
Optional/General comments	My suggestion is to go through soudh ganga site and see some ref manuscripts	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajib Kumar Roy
Department, University & Country	India