



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_47144
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO-ECONOMIC DETERMINANTS OF ORGANIC MANURING PRACTICES BY FARMERS IN SOUTHERN AGRICULTURAL ZONE, NASARAWA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are four specific objectives of the study stated in page 2 but only three were mentioned in the Abstract (second sentence). Include the objective “identify the constraints of organic manure practices”. The Abstract should also include salient findings for each of the four objectives.</p> <p>2. The research questions enumerated in page 2 can be deleted since it is enough that the objectives of the study were stated. (“Research questions” and “research objectives” are basically the same and only written in different forms; the former is in interrogative form and the latter in declarative form.)</p> <p>3. Table 4 in page 6 is incorrect. The “household size of 1-5” is missing. Also, be consistent on the use of either “family size” or “household size” since the words “family” and “household” are different. A person may be a member of a household but not of a family and vice versa and there may be two or more families in one household.</p> <p>4. Something is wrong on the collected and presented data in Tables 7 and 8. How come that the 90 respondents have “source of credit” (Table 8) if only 19 respondents have “access to credit” (Table 7)? And even if only the commercial banks and money lenders are to be included as sources of credit, 38 is still way higher than 19. And why is “personal saving” considered as “source of credit? Data cleaning is needed for this matter.</p> <p>5. The Conclusion should be revised. Conclusions should be strictly based on findings or results of the study (e.g. only age and cooperative membership can be considered determinant; and corruption can not be considered a constraint). There should also be a conclusion that corresponds to each specific objective. For each socio-economic variable, the conclusion should include only the category that has the highest percentage.</p>	All sections have been corrected according to the comments
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. In the Abstract, the computation of 90 as sample size or number of respondents was not clear. Revise the sentence containing such as follows: “Fifteen farmers from each of the six selected villages were purposively selected on the basis of their use of organic manure for a total of 90 respondents for the study.”</p> <p>2. Also in the Abstract, the labels “Objective (i), (ii), and (iv)” and “objective (iii)” were inappropriate since such were not indicated in the enumeration of objectives. The affected sentence can be rewritten as: “The first, second and fourth objectives were achieved using simple descriptive statistics such as frequency, percent and mean, while the third objective was achieved using multiple linear regression analysis.”</p> <p>3. The figure “20-39%” in the Abstract is incorrect. The affected sentence can be rewritten as: “The study revealed that majority or 61.1% of the respondents were in the age bracket of 20-39 years old, which indicates ....”</p> <p>4. All references cited in the text should be included in the list of references at the end of the paper. In particular, the following references should be included in the reference list: WCED 1987 (cited in page 2); and Adeniran et al. 2017 (cited in page 6).</p> <p>5. Check the spelling of an author's surname: Is it “Oguntowora” (page 2) or “Ogunfowora” (Reference 15, page 10)?</p> <p>6. In the bottom part of page 5, the statement “this was followed by those with 36.7%” should be corrected into “this was followed by those who had family size of 6-10 with 36.7%”. And check if it should be really “family size” or “household size”. (See Compulsory Revision Comment 3)</p> <p>7. In page 6, “Table 4.1.5” should be “Table 5”.</p> <p>8. For consistency of presentation (in reference to Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5), the “Variables” as column heading in Tables 3, 6, 7 and 8 may be replaced by “Marital Status” (Table 3), “Farm Size” (Table 6), “Access to Credit” (Table 7), and “Source of Credit” (Table 8).</p>	Correction done as reported by the reviewer



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	9. Only those references that are cited in the text should be included in the list of references at the end of the paper. In particular, the reference “Alimi 2002” (Reference 1) was not cited in the text and therefore should be deleted or excluded from the reference list.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. The Model Specification in pages 3-4 may be excluded. Common statistical formulas or models are no longer necessary to be explicitly stated in the paper. It is already sufficient to simply mention the statistical tools used for each objective. However, the regression equation of the study can be clearly stated and discussed in the Results and Discussion section.	

**PART 2:**

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