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| **PART 1: Comments** |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment****Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | this manuscript explores the factors influencing the export intentions of farmers' cooperatives in Nigeria, which is crucial for the nation's economic diversification and food security. the study provides valuable empirical data from a key agricultural region, offering insights that can inform both policy-making and academic discourse on agricultural development. the application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) in this context adds a useful dimension to understanding the motivational drivers behind farmers' economic decisions. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | yes, the title is suitable. it is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the scope and focus of the research, covering the subject (cooperative farming), purpose (agricultural produce export), location (southeast nigeria), and a summary of the analysis (problems and prospects). |  |
| **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 provides a good overview of the study. it clearly states the research purpose, methodology, sample, and key findings. to make it slightly more informative, i suggest specifying one or two of the most influential factors identified. for example, instead of just saying "key positive drivers," the authors could mention that "subjective norms and access to information were found to be the strongest positive drivers of export intention." this small addition would give readers a more concrete takeaway. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | based on the information presented, the manuscript has a strong methodological foundation but requires several revisions to ensure scientific correctness and clarity, here are the key points to address:1. in Table 2, the construct INFO has a rho\_A value of 1.039. Reliability coefficients like rho\_A [cannot be greater than 1.0](https://www.smartpls.com/faq/smartpls4/plsc-problems#:~:text=may%20produce%20inadmissible,1%20to%201.). This is a serious error in the model specification for that construct.
2. the text claims, "VIFs are within the 1-5 acceptance thresholds, indicating the absence of multicollinearity." However, Table 4 clearly shows ATT4 has a VIF of 5.967, which is outside this threshold. This is a direct contradiction and indicates a potential multicollinearity problem.
3. the conclusion states the mean for "intention" is 4.64, citing "Table 2." Table 2 is about reliability and validity; it contains no mean values.
 |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | the reference list has some good foundational sources, but it could be strengthened hence there are several references are quite dated (e.g., from the 1960, 1980s and 1990s). While classic texts are acceptable, for a topic like government policy and export incentives, relying on older sources is a weakness. I suggest incorporating more recent studies (from 2018 onwards) to ensure the discussion reflects the current economic and policy environment in Nigeria. |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | the English is generally understandable, but the article would benefit greatly from a thorough proofread. Some sentences are long and convoluted, which can obscure the meaning. Improving sentence structure, correcting minor grammatical errors, and ensuring consistent terminology will enhance the paper's clarity and professionalism. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | this study is built on a strong methodological foundation and addresses a relevant topic. to significantly enhance its scientific clarity, the results section would benefit from a careful revision. there appear to be a few inconsistencies between the statistical values presented in the tables and the narrative explanations, which could be readily corrected to ensure the manuscript's conclusions are fully supported by the data. |  |
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| **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?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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