



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_46777
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING THE CHOICE OF COOKING ENERGY SOURCES IN SOKOTO METROPOLIS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Abstract:</b> Keywords should be increased</li> <li><b>Page 3:</b> Lines 1 &amp; 2 The reference 'NNPC, 2012' was not listed. Even at that, it is too old for the prices of the commodities. This should be reviewed.</li> <li><b>Page 3:</b> Materials and Methods: Degree is represented with letter 'o' and not figure zero (0)</li> <li><b>Page 4:</b> Line 2: seasons should not be limited to a metropolis, but the country as a whole</li> <li><b>Page 8.</b> Discussion: Para 2: The statement that ' in Nigeria, sources of energy account for over 70% household energy supply' couldn't be true or incomplete. Look at the statement and reframe</li> <li><b>Page 9; Para 2: The sentences and the paragraph are too long. The followings are suggested:</b>                      Some socioeconomic factors were found to have significant relationship with the choice of energy. It was found out that income level has a great influence on the choice of energy use (i.e. the higher the income, the more people tend to use the best energy sources for cooking) The area in which they live contributes greatly to the source of energy used by respondents. It could be that in such areas, only few sources of energy are available to the people for cooking. Education attained also contribute to the source of energy use by respondents, the more educated ones tend to go for the best cooking sources of energy than the least educated people. The number of persons per household contributes to the source of energy used by various households. If the number of the persons is small, the household use the best energy source but when the <b>number of households</b> is much, they tend to use the cheaper sources of energy.                      Some socioeconomic characteristics has no influence on the choice of energy used by household such as occupation, gender and age. <b>This</b> means that regardless of these socioeconomic characteristics every individual want to use the best energy source for cooking.                      This study agrees with some the empirical study of the work of Onyekuru and Onyeji (2009), Yaqub <i>et al.</i> (2011) and Desalu (2012) and the concept of energy ladder model as used by different researchers on household energy (Davis 1998; Masera <i>et al.</i>, 2000). They found out that income, intra-household income distribution, socioeconomic distribution and household characteristics influences energy consumption levels.</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>7. <b>Page 10: Conclusion: Para 2:</b> No proof that more efficient energy types are made available, accessible and affordable. <b>Showing interest does not mean they are available</b></p> <p>8. <b>REFERENCES:</b> The following references were cited but not listed.</p> <p>(a) <b>Page 1:</b> Ouch, 2008                  (b) <b>Page 2:</b> World Bank, 2005                  (c) <b>Page 3:</b> NNPC, 2012                  (d) <b>Page 8:</b> NBS, 2006                  (e) <b>Page 9:</b> Akpan (2007) should be cited as "Akpan <i>et al.</i>, 2007"                  (f) <b>Page 9:</b> Desalu, 2002  <b>Page 10:</b> Rajimohan <i>et al.</i>, 2005</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The discussions can be improved upon	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adebisi Akinola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>