



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_48603
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption of Agroforestry Practices in Katsina State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>Good original research paper very much fit for publication by ARJA. However, some shortcomings need to be looked into before the paper is considered for publication:</p> <p>At the level of the introduction, the most recent scientific publications (2014 – 2019) in the domain should be sought for and cited in order to give it more relevance in today's context. Citing mainly papers dating to as far back as the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s does not do justice to the study.</p> <p>The methodology of the study does not permit replicability/repeatability. The methodology should be described in such a way that permits repeatability/replicability. And the statistical software used for data analysis should be imperatively stated.</p> <p>Moreover the results of the study are too descriptive. Effort should have been made to integrate some analytical statistics (chi-square, correlation, regression etc) in order to give the findings more depth.</p> <p>Discussion of findings poorly done. Findings should be discussed in a comparative manner i.e. comparing and contrasting the findings of the paper with the findings of other researchers who have carried out related research. As it stands, the author(s) of the paper have merely described the findings of the paper. Hence the author(s) of the paper should seek for recent scientific papers (2014 – 2019) that fall in line with the subject matter of the study and use them to discuss the findings. This will go a long way to give the findings more scientific relevance.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Most of the research works referenced in the paper are not very recent. Effort should be made to seek for the most recent scientific papers that fall in line with the subject matter of the study. This will give the paper more relevance in today's context.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Good empirical research paper that could be considered for publication by ARJA. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into consideration before the paper is considered for publication.</p>	

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nyong Princely Awazi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Dschang, Cameroon</i>