



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
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=sdi-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript needs for deep language revision. The text is hardly understandable in many parts, with many grammar and syntax errors, and very unclear sentences. Examples (non-exhaustive!): "Concerns for energy required for the running of homes"; "One of the reason that traditional energy sources is the preferred domestic fuel is that it does not require a complex and expensive infrastructure to be purchased and used as fuel." 2. Issues regarding the applied methods. The manuscript reports that "Stratified random Sampling technique was employed to choose the dwelling units within the metropolis where the questionnaire was administered.", however the text lacks of further explanations on how such method was actually applied, and with which results. According to the description of the area, Sokoto has a population of more than 3.6 million people, so it is not clear how three groups of 40 households only could be identified as a statistically significant sample for such an area. The method should be clearly described and justified in the text, including hypotheses, etc. 3. Many sentences reported in the "discussion" and "conclusions" sections seem hardly supported by the data analysis. Hereafter some detailed comments (extracts from the text in between inverted commas). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. "Cooking gas and fuelwood/charcoal are the most used probably because it is readily available for using, unlike kerosene which might be scarce sometimes and electricity might not be available due to power failure." → it is not clear why the main reason of fuel choice was apparently not investigated through the questionnaires, instead of discussing it ex-post in a hypothetical way, not supported by data analysis. b. "Many respondents goes for electricity and cooking gas as the best source of energy when given preference probably because of its awareness that cooking gas is becoming cheaper and cooks food better compared to other sources and electricity might be cheaper and more efficient when it is readily available, fuelwood/charcoal as the least chosen because of awareness on how dangerous it is to the environment, kerosene also is not always available and when even available tends not to be cheap." → a similar comment applies here. Why the Authors did not explicitly investigate this point through the questionnaires, if it was relevant to their objective? c. "It was found out that income level has a great influence on the choice of 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>energy use (i.e. the higher the income, the more people tend to use the best energy sources for cooking)" → the chi-square test is a test that provides information on <i>correlation</i>, but cannot be used to define any <i>causality</i> link, which instead seems here the case. Please rephrase the sentence and/or the concept to avoid any possible ambiguity.</p> <p>d. "The use of electricity is mostly associated with its availability; gas is associated with levels of education, price and income. Kerosene is associated with its availability and high price; fuelwood/charcoal is associated with cheapness and availability." → No disaggregated analysis reporting the correlation between a specific fuel type and a specific socio-economic variable is reported in the manuscript. Therefore, the statements reported in this sentence are not supported by the statistical analysis. On the other hand, disaggregated analyses are in fact necessary to draw meaningful, non-general considerations and results. Therefore, this kind of analysis should be added to the study to achieve a sufficient level of details.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some references cited in the text are not present in the bibliography. For example: <i>Ouch, 2008; Rajimohan et al., 2005</i>. Please check coherence between text and bibliography. 2. In the text, the following sentence is found: "Generally, rural communities are mainly characterized by high population density". The concept sounds strange, especially given the fact that the sentence is aimed at comparing the situation with urban centers, that are expected to be characterized by higher population density. Please better explain or rephrase. 3. The expression "Chi-square test of association" is ambiguous. I assume you probably meant "Chi-square test of independence". 4. The reference "Masera et al., 2000" is apparently cited as a support to the model of the <i>energy ladder</i>. However Masera et al. actually express a strong critique to such model. Please rephrase the sentence. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Authors have proposed a study with the objective to investigate which socio-economic factors can influence the choice of cooking fuels. The subject is interesting, and the target context (Sokoto, Nigeria) has not yet been analysed under this perspective. However, the paper in the present form is characterized by strong methodological gaps. The statistical analysis is very limited, lacks of adequate level of disaggregation, and do not provide sufficient information to support the conclusions.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jacopo Barbieri
Department, University & Country	Politecnico di Milano, Italy