



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49030
Title of the Manuscript:	NTFP Utilization and its impact on Poverty Reduction among Rural Women in Ondo 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>The introduction lacks the information on the socioeconomic aspects of the inhabitants of the region. The political aspect which influences the poverty of the population in general, was not treated. Specify whether the geographical position and political influences on the economy or not.</p> <p>Most definitions reported in "Concept of NTFPs" are repeated phrases from the introduction. From my point of view, there is no need to present this section as specified in the introduction (the concepts of NTFPs).</p> <p>The study area lacks the information on the population density for each sampled subarea. Figure 1 corresponding to information about the limitations of "Edo and Delta states bound Ondo (East), on the Ogun and Osun states (West), Ekiti and Kogi states (North) and the Bight of Benin and the Atlantic Ocean (South)" it was not presented in the text.</p> <p>Line 130: Under the concept of vegetation, the manuscript provides a list of species based on the book of Keay (1959), on the classification of Nigerian vegetation, where they present the dominant species of different areas: a) the magoroves; b) rain forest; c) the avanna. However, the paper does not present the list of species of timber forest most important from the point of view of the economic (bioenergy, medicinal plants, handicrafts, fiber production, food and construction).</p> <p><i>Method of Data Analysis</i> which aims to apply the descriptive statistics, this confusing. The methodology does not specify the registered variables (qualitative and quantitative variables). A descriptive analysis of information is not just a simple calculating of percentage values; it is important to use the non - parametric statistics as evidence of goodness of fit chi-square contingency tables and nonparametric ANOVA (Friedman test and Cochran for example). Therefore, this manuscript only limit calculates the percentage values.</p> <p>Hypotheses Tested. The hypotheses are not consistent with the methodology. Between independence tests the income earned by rural women from the utilization of NTFPs and Their age only could be verified by contingency tables (Chi2).</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>The socio - economic Characteristics of the respondents, was not specified in the methodology nor in the introduction.</p> <p>The results of Table 2 corresponding to socio - economic characteristics were expressed on the basis of the percentage values. These results do not provide new knowledge about the NTFP Utilization and Its Impact on Poverty.</p> <p>It is recommended to report the monetary income of women in dollar instead of the Nigerian currency.</p> <p>The results of Tables 1 (Socio - economic Characteristics of Respondents in the study area) and 2 (NTFPs Common Utilized by rural women in the Study Area), are a compilation of information from the book edited by Field Survey, 2018. Therefore it is not original research on NTFP Utilization.</p> <p>The results presented on the following aspects require the statistical support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact of NTFPs utilization on income earned by rural women in the Study Area. 2. Annual Income realized by respondents from the utilization of NTFPs in the study area. 3. Problems faced by rural women in the utilization of NTFPs in the study area <p>The application of a test on goodness of fit by the chi2, does not enough to validate the statistical support.</p> <p>In summary, there are some inconsistencies between the interpreted results and the proposed methodology.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The manuscript has been modified according to the reviewer's suggestions.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Lines 8, 33, 123: delete "(Arial Bold, 11 font, left aligned, caps)". Line 11: Change "NTFPs" to "Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs)". Line 14: specify "LAGs". Line 18 Change "were" to "was". Lines 36-37: Change "In the same vein [3] That NOTED" to ". In the same vein, Canagarajah et al, [3] that noted" Line 39: Change "According to [4] vast majority of" to "According to Ikojo, [4] a vast majority of". Line 41 & 44: change "however" to "however," change "abundance" to "abundance," Line 51 & 53: change "[8] That NOTED Present " to "Osemeobo, [8] also noted that" ; "[9] That NOTED" to "Adedayo, [9] that noted" Line 65 "change" According to [10] NTFPs" to "According to the Central African Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE), [10] NTFPs " Line 70: delete "[10]". Line 86: change "[13] Also defined" to "Wickens, [13] also defined" Line 92: change "[15] That maintained" to "Olajide, [15] maintained that" Line 106: change "[17] NOTED That" to "Oyun, [17] noted that" Line 118: change "[20] That Stated" to "Adebisi, [20] stated that" Line 126: Change "Ondo State lies Between latitude 5 45¹ and 8 ° 15¹ N and longitude 4 # 25¹ and 6 ° 5¹ E" to "Ondo State lies between 5 45¹ - 8 ° 15¹ N latitude and 4 ° 25¹ - 6 ° 5¹ E longitude ". Line 127: change "kilometer" to "kilometers". Line 139: Change the subtitle "<i>Method of Data Collection</i>" to "Metodoly" Line 148: Change "in addition" to "in Addition," Line 151: Change the subtitle "<i>Method of Data Collection</i>" to "Data Analysis" Line 176: Change "[22] noted" to "Adedayo, [22] noted" Line 182: Change "[24] noted" to "Vitta, [24] noted" Line 196: The Source: Field Survey, 2018, was not reported in the literature. Line 206: Change "As NOTED by [26] the" to "As noted by Ukwuaba, [26] the" Lines 225, 228, 232 & 238: Change "[27] That NOTED"; "[28] noted"; "[9] That NOTED" & "[29] That NOTED" to "Adedayo and Oyun, [27] that noted"; "FAO [28] noted"; "Adedayo et al., [9] that noted" & "Adedayo [29] that noted".</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	