

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3808
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing Small-Holder Food Crops Farmers' Adoption Intention Behaviour on Modern Agricultural Technology among the Non-Adopter in Sarawak's Rural Areas
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 an important and under-explored area in the context of agricultural technology adoption, particularly in rural regions like Sarawak. Understanding the factors that influence small-holder farmers' intention to adopt modern agricultural technologies is critical for improving productivity and ensuring sustainable agricultural development. The paper is highly relevant for policymakers, agricultural extension services, and researchers working to improve farming practices in rural Southeast Asia. By focusing on non-adopters, the study fills a significant gap in the literature, providing a fresh perspective on overcoming barriers to technology adoption. The use of a rigorous methodological framework, specifically the UTAUT model combined with CB-SEM analysis, adds scientific value to the study. This manuscript provides both theoretical and practical insights into how to enhance agricultural productivity through technology adoption, which can contribute significantly to the broader goal of food security and poverty reduction.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and descriptive but could benefit from slight revision for conciseness. A more streamlined title might be: This revision improves readability and directly highlights the key theme (adoption intention) and target group (non-adopting small-holder farmers).	
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.	Suggested Addition: "This study not only offers insights into the psychological and demographic factors influencing adoption but also proposes actionable strategies for governments and agricultural organizations to enhance the uptake of modern agricultural technologies."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, with clearly defined sections and subsections. The structure facilitates readability and logical progression. However, there are a few recommendations for improvement: Policy Implications: Consider adding a dedicated section on Policy Implications that consolidates the findings related to improving adoption strategies. This will provide clear, actionable guidance for policymakers. Conclusion: The conclusion could be expanded to emphasize the theoretical contribution of the study in the context of technology adoption literature. Additionally, summarizing the practical steps for improving adoption rates would help to directly link the findings to real-world applications.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically	The manuscript is scientifically robust. The authors employ UTAUT (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology) as the theoretical framework, which is a widely accepted model for understanding technology adoption. The use of Covariance-Based Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM) is	

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>appropriate for testing the relationships between variables and ensures the reliability and validity of the results.</p> <p>Strengths: The combination of a well-established theoretical model and sophisticated statistical analysis (CB-SEM) enhances the scientific rigor of the study. The study presents a clear research question and hypothesis and employs appropriate methods to test them.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Sample Size: The sample size (108 respondents) is relatively small, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. While the results are valuable, the authors should acknowledge the sample size limitation and suggest that future research should involve a larger, more diverse sample.</p> <p>Geographic Scope: The study focuses exclusively on Sarawak, which, while relevant, may limit the broader applicability of the findings. Including farmers from other regions (e.g., Peninsular Malaysia or other Southeast Asian countries) would provide a broader perspective.</p> <p>Suggestions: In the limitations section, explicitly state that the small sample size and regional focus should be addressed in future studies. Comparison with other regions: Future research could include a comparative study of Sarawak's adoption patterns with other regions in Southeast Asia, to better understand regional differences.</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 literature review is adequate, providing a good overview of previous studies related to technology adoption in agriculture. However, there is room to strengthen the theoretical foundation by including additional recent studies and comparing findings from other Southeast Asian countries.</p> <p>Suggestions: Include studies from Thailand, Vietnam, and other Southeast Asian countries that have explored agricultural technology adoption among small-holder farmers. This would broaden the comparative framework and strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the field. Cite more recent publications (from 2021 onwards) to ensure the study reflects the latest trends in technology adoption and rural development.</p>	

Review Form 2

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used is generally appropriate for academic communication. However, there are minor issues with redundancy and clarity in some sections.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Repetitive Phrasing: Some sentences repeat the same ideas. For example, the introduction and conclusion sections restate similar points regarding the importance of the study. These sections could be streamlined to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>Grammatical Errors: There are minor grammatical errors, such as in the use of tenses and plural forms. For example, "techonogies" should be corrected to "technologies." A thorough proofreading is recommended.</p> <p>Technical Terminology: Ensure that technical terms such as CB-SEM and UTAUT are defined clearly for readers who may not be familiar with these methods.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Justification: The manuscript is strong in its theoretical framework and methodology. The findings are valuable and have significant implications for agricultural policy and technology adoption strategies. However, the authors should address the limitations related to sample size, regional focus, and language clarity. Incorporating more recent studies and strengthening the policy implications section would further improve the manuscript's impact.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Haishui Yan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>China</p>