



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_50941
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Chainsaw Milling Enterprise in Benue State, Nigeria
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	<p>The article presents an Assessment of Chainsaw Milling Enterprise in Benue State, Nigeria.</p> <p>Some of the following points deserve to be reviewed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The abstract should be presented in a single paragraph. 2) As objectives were defined: "This study has been accessed the marketing efficiency with the view of evaluating its potential contribution to the livelihoods and economic development of Benue State", however, the study was broader and was not restricted only to the marketing efficiency. I suggest that you broaden the objectives by making clear everything that you intended to demonstrate with the article. 3) The bibliographic revision is based on very old bibliographies, I suggest that a new revision be made, in more updated references. 4) The data is from 2013, it is already 2019. Why not consider more updated data? 5) The methods adopted are adequate but the objectives should be reviewed to correlate them. 6) The results are in accordance with the methodology and support the conclusions presented. There is only the flaw in the question of data coming from 2013. Considering that we are in 2019, in the current scenario, is this situation no other? Is the research no longer outdated? I suggest updating the references, the most current is 2013. It is likely that in 05 years, other relevant studies have been published that can be considered to support the article. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benedito Albuquerque da
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso, Brasil