



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_46476
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics of Cocoyam marketing in Anambra Agricultural Zone of Anambra 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Please present your work with this format and remove irrelevancies there.</p> <p>i)Title of the work ii)Objectives of the study iii)Sample size and sampling procedure iv)Method of data collection v)Method of Data analysis vi)Results and Discussion vii) Recommendations</p> <p>NLB; Recast the recommendation in your abstract. Please, check your grammar.</p> <p>Keyword; Economics, Cocoyam, marketing, Anambra Agricultural Zone of Anambra State, Nigeria</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Lines 62; Is that bought or brought Lines 91 – 94 should placed before Line 87. NIB; Many grammatical problems.</p> <p>Line 95 ;This not methodology but MATERIALS AND METHODS Lines 97 and 98 are the only statements that are correct here. I think I had worked in this terrain as extension officer with Otuocho as my abode. Based on the above assertion, I have the following comments I).You left Anambra Agricultural Zone of Anambra State which is one of the Agricultural Zones in Anambra State (Onitsha, Awka and Aguata) to discuss Anambra State. No it cannot be. . 2)Discuss the zone under the following; i) Latitude and Longitude location of the zone, the population of the area and land area,. ii)The local governments Areas in the zone; Oyi, Anambra East and West, Ayamelum etc iii) The boundaries of the zone iv) The no. of blocks and circles in the zone. vi) The major markets in the Local Government Areas or blocks vii) The farming activities and off farm income engaged by the inhabitants. viii) Please you could consult the zonal manager of zone (Mr Nnalue, Gilbert) for these information. He is my personal friend.</p> <p>Line 111 = Should be Sampling procedure and Sample size not Data collection as you said, since you select respondents before you collect data from them. Lines 130 – 134; Your selection procedures as in lines are not clear. Please, throw more light on the use of Snow Ball Method (SBM). You used 60 respondents (40 retailers and 20 wholesalers), don't you think you will introduce bias by having these differentials. Lines 115 – 117= Move them out to sampling procedure and sample size Lines 135 – 155; Data Analysis; Please put the statistical tools equations in model form and number them.</p> <p>Results and Discussion; Lines 157 – 178; You needed reorganizations and recasting of</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>The Abstract has been restructured based on this reviewer's comments.</p> <p>I agree. The right keywords were placed as appropriate.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The word is "bought" (Past tense of buy). Line 91 -94. I think it is in the right order because line 87 is part of the study significance while 91-94 are research questions.</p> <p>The grammatical problems were corrected. Line 95: This depends on the style of Journal. Some of the Journals use METHODOLOGY while others use MATERIALS AND METHODS. The later was use as this reviewer suggested. Values were added in line with the reviewer.</p> <p>The zone was discussed as recommended with exception of the zone's Latitude, longitude, and land area. Latitude and longitude of the state were given earlier. Those of the zone were not accessed from seen secondary sources, but the location of the zone in the state was adequately given.</p> <p>I agree. It was re renamed as recommended. Values were added to the existing selection procedure. Further information on the Snowball sampling method (SBSM) were given. The retailers were greater in number than the wholesalers. The equations were numbered as recommended.</p> <p>Findings and discussions were reorganized as deemed appropriate. It discussed the respondents' distribution. It is qualitative and an introductory study. Corrections in this direction were made. Further studies may be restructured for accessing enough data for calculation of the other market information such as the Gini Coefficient and the Lorenz curve.</p> <p>Lines 194 -197 statements were broken down and restructured. The equations are now numbered as recommended. Percentage is the unit of measurement of the variable. It has been stated. Lines 228 – 230 were discussed between lines 230 and 236. However, additional discussion has been added.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>the findings of results and discussion Lines 179 and 180; pie chart. Your information on the pie chart should include the cocoyam sourced from outside the state, since your discussion talked about that.</p> <p>Lines 194 – 197; Please recast the statement. Line 213; Please number the equation accordingly Line 214; What is the unit of measurement of the variable Lines 217 – 225; Check your grammar.</p> <p>Lines 228- 230; You only presented the result without discussing them. Why? Lines 227 -236 should be the last objective to be discussed and Table 2 changed to Table 3 Lines 237 – 253= Should be moved above line 228 and the Table 3 changed to Table 2 Lines 238 – 241; What are the sources of the information. NLB; Please report your findings in the past tense or present continuous tense</p> <p>Lines 273 – 278= Conclusion Your conclusion is faulty. It should be done objective by objective and in precise form. Recommendation Your recommendations were not sharp and precise. Please recast them and add more recommendations based on your findings. Please delete lines 287 – 291, not part of this study.</p> <p>References Lines 292 - 337= . Your referencing is never in consistent to the journal methodology (as per arrangement of reference, date of publication, placements of initials of authors and others). .Please consult the published work or guideline to that effect.</p>	<p>The sources of the information were the questionnaire, observation and experience. The sources have been indicated. I agree. Findings have been reported as recommended. Lines 273 – 278 = Conclusion. Findings have been presented in more precise form. Recommendations Lines 287 – 291 were deleted. The recommendations were represented.</p> <p>References. The references were rearranged as exemplified in a published article of AJAEES.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		This reviewer's comments added considerable value to the manuscript.

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>	

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>