

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Economics and Entrepreneurship
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_ 3336.3
Title of the Manuscript:	COPING MECHANISMS OF FEMALE AGRIPRENEURS IN RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE-INDUCED FOOD SYSTEM DISRUPTIONS
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.	This manuscript addresses a crucial topic for the scientific community, focusing on the coping mechanisms of female agripreneurs facing climate-induced challenges in food systems. The study offers valuable insights into adaptive strategies that enhance sustainability and resilience in agriculture, particularly for vulnerable groups. By exploring indigenous practices and innovative marketing solutions, the research contributes to broader discussions on climate adaptation in agribusiness. The findings hold potential to influence policy and support for agripreneurs, making this work an essential contribution to climate adaptation literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title of the article is quite descriptive but could be clearer and more concise.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title: Female Agripreneurs' Strategies for Coping with Climate-Driven Food System Disruptions"</p> <p>This alternative keeps the focus on the core topic and highlights the adaptation to climate challenges without overly complex wording.</p>	
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.	<p>Some terms and sentences could be simplified for easier understanding, especially for readers unfamiliar with technical jargon.</p> <p>The mention of the "Binary Logistic Regression model" could be briefly explained to make it accessible. Adding a few words on why this model was chosen would provide clarity.</p> <p>The findings about indigenous crop use and new marketing initiatives are valuable. Briefly highlighting their significance in coping with climate impacts would enhance understanding.</p> <p>Including a concise statement about the implications of the findings, such as their potential impact on policy or future research directions, would make the conclusion more comprehensive.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The manuscript has a well-organized structure, but there are areas where the sections and subsections can be improved for clarity and coherence. Here are a few observations:</p> <p>The abstract clearly outlines the study's purpose, methodology, and findings. However, it might benefit from a brief mention of the specific coping mechanisms studied to give readers a clearer preview.</p> <p>The introduction provides a comprehensive background on the importance of climate change impacts on agriculture. It's quite detailed, which helps in understanding the study's context. However, it could be streamlined by focusing more on the direct link to the coping mechanisms of female agripreneurs.</p> <p>The methods are divided into subsections that clarify the study area, sampling, and model selection. The use of tables for explanatory variables is helpful for readers, but the model section could benefit from a more straightforward explanation of why specific variables were chosen.</p>	

Review Form 2

	<p>This section is broken down by segments (industry, commerce, trade), which provides a logical flow. Each sub-section (like "High input costs" and "Irregular input supplies") is clearly labeled, making it easier for readers to follow. However, the transitions between sub-subsections could be smoother to connect ideas better.</p> <p>The conclusion effectively summarizes the study's findings and implications. However, separating the "Conclusion," "Implications," and "Recommendations" into distinct subsections would make it easier to navigate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-structured research methodology and rigorous analysis. The use of a binary logistic regression model to identify coping mechanisms is appropriate and provides clear insights into the relationships between climate-induced challenges and the responses of female agripreneurs. The study's sample and data collection methods are well-aligned with the research objectives, enhancing the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the discussion section effectively integrates literature and provides context, adding depth to the findings and demonstrating the study's relevance to current climate change and agribusiness literature.</p>	
<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 in this paper are relevant and cover several recent sources, especially from 2024, which supports the timeliness of the study. However, some references, such as Barrios et al. (2008) and Parry et al. (2004), are older and may need updated insights if available. The addition of recent literature from 2023–2024 in similar contexts or updated reviews on climate change impacts on agriculture could enhance the reference list's robustness.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in your article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but minor revisions could improve clarity, especially for non-native English readers.</p> <p>Some sentences are long and complex, which may hinder readability.</p> <p>Replace technical or complex words with simpler terms where possible.</p> <p>Ensure consistency in terminology, particularly with specialized terms, to avoid confusing readers.</p> <p>Replace phrases like "in line with agribusiness's scope" with simpler expressions like "related to agribusiness."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pongsiri Kamkankaew
Department, University & Country	North-Chiang Mai University, Thailand