

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52370

Date: 19 June 2025

Title: Analyse of the determinants of improving the living conditions of women vegetable farmers in the municipality of Grand-Popo in Benin

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision√.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: Dr Ahmed M. Saqr

Date: 19 June 2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This manuscript addresses a highly relevant issue by analyzing the socio-economic determinants impacting the living conditions of women vegetable farmers in Grand-Popo, Benin. A key strength lies in its mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative interviews and quantitative data to offer nuanced insights into the challenges of access to financing, market constraints, and organizational gaps. The work contributes valuable knowledge for both policymakers and local stakeholders seeking to empower women and enhance sustainable development in the agricultural sector.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled "Analyse of the determinants of improving the living conditions of women vegetable farmers in the municipality of Grand-Popo in Benin" for the International Journal of Agricultural Research. The paper explores the multifaceted challenges faced by women vegetable producers in Grand-Popo, Benin, combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. While the topic is

REVIEWER'S REPORT

timely and significant, especially for the discourse on rural women's empowerment and local food systems, the manuscript requires substantial revision for clarity, methodological rigor, and comprehensive analysis. Therefore, I recommend a major revision. My detailed comments are provided below.

Major Comments**1. Abstract**

Can the authors clarify and streamline the abstract to better communicate the research objective, the main findings (with some quantitative results), and the practical implications for policy or stakeholders?

2. Introduction

The introduction gives an overview of the context, but can the authors better articulate the research problem, clarify the identified knowledge gaps in the literature, and state specific research questions or hypotheses?

3. Methodological Approach

The methods section mentions qualitative and quantitative approaches. Can the authors provide more details on:

Sampling strategy and its rationale,

The design and contents of the questionnaires/interview guides,

Steps in qualitative data analysis (coding, theme development)?

Any ethical considerations (e.g., informed consent)?

4. Data Analysis

Data analysis appears to primarily use descriptive statistics. Did the authors conduct any inferential statistical analyses to support their conclusions? If not, can they justify this choice, or consider basic inferential analysis?

5. Presentation and Interpretation of Results (Results Section)

Much of the results section is narrative and quotes from informants. Could the authors improve the clarity and rigor by:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Summarizing key quantitative findings in tables or figures,

Highlighting the representativeness of qualitative statements (are these typical or exceptional cases?),

Providing clearer links between results and the research questions?

6. Figures and Tables

The manuscript refers to several figures (e.g., Figures 1, 2, 3), but the descriptions and the quality of the visual materials are limited. Can the authors improve figure quality, ensure all figures are self-explanatory, and provide complete legends?

7. Discussion

The discussion draws on relevant literature but is somewhat repetitive and descriptive. Can the authors deepen their analysis by:

Drawing clearer comparisons between their findings and those in similar contexts,

Critically discussing limitations,

Outlining actionable policy or community recommendations?

8. Conclusion

The conclusion largely summarizes the findings but lacks specificity about the study's broader implications. Can the authors succinctly state the key insights, actionable recommendations, and directions for future research?

9. References

References contain inconsistencies and several web links lack full bibliographic details. Can the authors standardize references according to the journal guidelines and ensure all citations are necessary and relevant?

Minor Comments**1. Abstract**

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Please avoid using both French and English in the abstract unless requested by the journal; clarify language use.

2. Introduction

Some sentences are too long and convoluted. Please revise for clarity and conciseness.

3. Methods

Clearly define all terms and abbreviations at first use (e.g., explain "tontine").

4. Figures/Tables

Ensure all tables and figures are numbered sequentially and cited in the text.

5. Results

State the sample size (n) clearly at the beginning of the results and in each relevant subsection.

6. Quotations

Attribute direct quotes clearly and consistently (age, occupation, date).

7. Formatting

Ensure consistent use of section headings and subheadings for easier navigation.

8. Language and Style

Carefully proofread for typographical, grammatical, and formatting errors throughout.