



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_46606
Title of the Manuscript:	MARKETING EFFICIENCY OF ORANGE-FLESHED SWEET POTATO (OFSP) (<i>Ipomoea batata</i> (L) Lam) IN 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 Introduction Methodology	<p>INTRODUCTION It is mixed up with the literature review, there should be a brief chapter on literature review. Introduction – should focus on OFSP the difference it has with other ordinary sweet potato Importance of OFSP is not clear thus needs to be included properly</p> <p>METHODOLOGY Study area. Indicate why study area was selected method used to select the study area out of 13 possible. Sampling procedure and Data collection Extremely shallow and does not show any procedure followed to arrive at the results discussed. Needs thorough rewriting.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Socio- Economic characteristics of the respondent The results does not show any scientific significance of the named traits in advancement of OFSP. Scientific correlation needs to be shown Determinant of OFSP Marketers Discussion not clear needs to be redone . Results not well discussed i.e what is it that influences the marketing of OFSP needs to clearly come out</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>OBJECTIVES Should be on its on not mixed with introduction Second objective needs to be paraphrased to bring out the intended meaning</p>	
Optional/General comments	Good paper however it has a lot of generalities most of which are not scientific	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Onyango Rosally Anyango</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kenyatta University, Kenya</i>