



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_46505
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF PROCESS PLAN ON AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES PERFORMANCE IN KENYA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The paper is relatively good but it seems that there is a need for a total revision of the whole paper for the simple reason that the objectives of the study, the framework, the results, and the discussion do not correspond with each other. Among many other things to be further considered for revisions, the following are some major concerns: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The framework includes "legal support" and "government policies" but these were never mentioned in the objectives and no result about these was presented. There were results on the relationships of gender, age, position, years as member, education and type of plan to "process plan", "coffee class", "milling loss" and "duration of payment" but these were not part of the stated objectives and the framework. The results of regression analysis were inadequate. Except for the regression model, the "Discussion" did not also match the "Results". The "model" in Figure 2 was inconsistent with the results since the study do not have results on the relationship among budgeting, activity schedule and investment plans. The Abstract was also poorly constructed and there are "claims" in the Abstract that were not part of the paper. For example, focus group discussion was stated in the Abstract but that was not part of the Methodology (nor of the Results) of the paper. Chi-square test was also mentioned in the Abstract but its use was not reported in the paper. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Legal support and government policies are intervening variables that could only interfere positively or negatively on process plan implementation, hence not part of the variables that were to be investigated. It was assumed to be held constant in the research. The variables are part of determinants ingredients of actualization of process plan implementation towards the coffee cooperative societies performance which is measured on the class of coffee (quality), milling loss (quantity) and duration of payment (Time) items which are key on project planning and management It captured the three factors of the interest of this research work, hence for the interest of the scope. My opinion is, it is well captured, basically the quality of coffee in terms of class, quantity loss hence remaining and timeliness in payment. Furthermore there is a information of what is important in the actualization proper process planning which could be education, age, operations by management Budgeting, activity schedule and investment are process plan items which influence cooperative performance in various project constraint area in terms of cost, time, scope or quality Removed focus group discussion and chi-square test in the abstract
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The citation "Project management Body of Knowledge [PMBOK], 2017" in page 1 should be "Project Management Institute, 2017" (see the last reference in page 12). The arrow from "Activity schedule box" (see Figure 1) is pointing "nowhere". Revise the figure accordingly. In Research Methodology, further explain how the sample size of 346 was derived or computed. The statement "led to random result" should be clearly explained as well. It is more appropriate to state "0.05 margin of error" as ".05 level of significance". In the presentation Results, it was not clear why Pearson correlation was used. This was not also explained in the Methodology. Note also that Pearson correlation is not the appropriate test for nominal and ordinal data. Revise the said sections accordingly. The title of the second subsection in Results is "Simple regression ..." but the results presented were through the use of multiple regression analysis, as there are three independent variables. Further, all the tables and results from the multiple regression analysis should be presented and discussed and not just the "coefficient table". 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected as noted Corrected Corrected Pearson correlation was used to relate the items if process plans on the coffee cooperative society performance Corrected as indicated
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	