



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46605
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF CRISIS ON YAM PRODUCTION 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research questions and objectives of the study are basically the same. There is no need to present both in a relatively short paper. Delete the research questions presented in page 2. The objectives are also suggested to be presented with numbers. 2. The objectives of the study and the presentation of results should have one-to-one correspondence. The order of presentation of the results (pages 4-9) is as follows: (1) socioeconomic characteristics, (2) yam production before and after conflict, and (3) factors affecting yam production. Hence, the objectives should be rearranged and re-stated as follows: (1) determine the socioeconomic characteristics of the farmers, (2) compare the gross margin of yam production before and after the crisis or conflict, and (3) determine the factors affecting yam production. Notice that the first objective needs to be changed from "determine the effect of socio-economic variables on yam production in the study area" to simply "determine the socioeconomic characteristics of the farmers" since no result was presented as regards "effect". With these, the second sentence of the Abstract should also be revised accordingly. 3. Delete the hypothesis in page 2. The paper did not test such hypothesis and no result regarding such was presented. 4. For better comprehension, long sentences should be paraphrase into several shorter and clear sentences. In particular, revise the following: (1) the sentence "Tonah (2006) ... other." (bottom of page 1); (2) the sentence "Table 3 ... area." (first sentence in page 9), and (3) the sentence "The study ... farmers." (last sentence of Conclusions and Recommendations in page 9). 	<p>Research question removed</p> <p>Corrected accordingly</p> <p>Sentence has been reframed as per the suggestion</p> <p>Hypothesis deleted</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the fifth sentence of the Abstract, delete the words "in table 2". 2. In the third to the last line of page 1, change "headsmen" into "herdsmen". 3. The year of survey "2018" in Table 1a should also be 2017 just like in other tables. 4. In the results on "Age" (page 4), change "majority 41.7%" into "most or 41.7%". (The word majority connotes more than 50%). 5. In the results on "Marital Status" (page 5), change "33.3% were divorced and 33.3% were widowed respectively" into "3.3% were divorced and another 3.3% were widowed". 6. In the results on "Family Size" (page 5), change "majority 45.0%" into "most or 45%". 7. In the results on "Farming Experience" (page 6), change "majority 35.0%" into "most or 35%". 8. The citation "Ayanuyi" should be changed into "Ayanwuyi" (see Reference 2 in page 10). 9. Recheck the correct spelling of the reference author's surname: "Breuser" in the citation in page 1 or "Breusers" in Reference 4 in page 10; "Okeoghene" in the citation in page 2 or "Okeocyhene" in Reference 10 in page 10. 10. The following references cited in the text should also be included in the list of references in page 10: Bermadet 1999 (page 1), Klein et al. 2012 (page 2), Migap and Audu 2012 (page 2), Binbo and Marcus 2005 (page 2), Ogumbameru 2001 (page 4), Johnson, Dingkuhn and Jones 1998 (page 5), Akimbile 2007 (page 5), Muneer 2008 (page 5), Negash 2007 (page 5), and Messers et al. 2001 (page 6). 11. The following references listed in page 10 but were not cited in the text should be deleted: Blench 1994 (Reference 3), FAO 2013 (Reference 5), and Klelh, Philips, Micynouna, Ogbonna and Siwoku 2012 (Reference 8). 	<p>All corrections have been done as per the suggestion</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Reference corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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