SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_50390**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Determinants of Poverty Status of Cassava-based farmers in Imo State, Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Short 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)

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	**This might make an interesting paper one day but it needs revisions before that can happen:** - **More should be done in the literature review to explain what is known about this subject and what is not known and that can, therefore, be addressed by the current research. It is not at all clear to me at the moment what new knowledge is being sought by the researcher;** - **In the methodology section, there should be a comparison between the demographic characteristics of the sample achieved and of the population as a whole. The method of questionnaire development and testing should also be explained in more detail.** - **A discussion section is required in which the findings are discussed in the light of the gaps in knowledge that should have been identified at the conclusion of the literature review. This is where the claim for contribution to academic knowledge should be made;** - **The conclusion should include the research limitations and suggestions for future research. Currently, the recommendations included in this section do not appear to be supported by the research and should be delelted if not justified.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

SDI Review Form 1.6

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***John Walsh***
Department, University & Country	***School of Business and Management, RMIT, Vietnam***