



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJAEES/2194
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF GENDER DIFFERENTIALS IN SWEET POTATOES PRODUCTION OUTPUT IN OSUN STATE

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Though the objective intended to analyse in the paper is relevant in the developing world and has policy implications, authors need to revise some of the part in order to publish in the journal. Some key issues needed to be revised and included are follows as: 1. The methodology part of the paper is insufficient. The author should clearly mention about the methodology (if possible with some theoretical/conceptual framework) as separate section in the paper with specific explanation of CD production function and reasons using CD. Detail explanation of CD is required. It is not clear to the readers how authors measure productivity and efficiency. Productivity Methodology part (or conceptual framework or econometric specifications) should have details about the techniques, combined with the strengths of using the specific method. 2. Authors need to differentiate descriptive statistics and econometric results, because descriptive statistics are used to support the econometric results and therefore descriptive statistics should not be an evidence for policy recommendations. 3. Results and discussions are quite lengthy and not coherent, needs to be rephrase. 4. It will be better, if authors explain the research gap in this type of study, and how this paper fill this gap (this should be somewhere between 98 to 107 lines) mainly in the context of the study area (i.e. region or country). 5. Authors should rephrase results and discussions, summary and conclusion and abstract more concisely and precisely. 6. Tables should put with the text not in annex. Results of the significance of econometric estimation can show either by t-value or by standard error, do not need to put both statistics. 7. Table 6 & 7 should merge into one Table. 8. Some of literatures cited in the paper need to be updated with latest one. In line 67-68, it should be updated with latest data. 9. Literature cited in 96-97 lines does not seem to be relevant in African context.	1. the methodology had been improved upon by proving information theoretical information on the CD. 2. the descriptive statistics are made different from the econometric results. 3. all the necessary details are included in the discussion for better understanding of the subject matter. 4. this had been properly done. 5. Results and Discussion, summary, conclusion and abstract rephrased concisely and precisely. 6. Tables have been properly put appropriately in the text and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. It is recommended to review some relevant and latest literature in order to get more insights in these types of studies. Some notable studies are: (a) Male-Female differences in agricultural productivity: methodological issues and empirical evidence (Quisumbing, 1996); (b) Gender differentials in farm productivity: implications for household efficiency and agricultural policy (Udry et al., 1996); (c) Gender differentials in resources ownership and crop productivity of smallholder farmers in Africa: a case study (Pannin and Brumer, 2000) and (c) Understanding gender differences in agricultural productivity in Uganda and Nigeria (Piterman et al, 2010)).	7. Tables have been merged. 8. the author was unable to get any other latest data on sweet potatoes than the one stated. 9. literature has been updated. 10. papers were reviewed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Generally tables need to reduce and present more clearly in a compact form. For example, producers' sweet potato output (Table 4) would be better to present as output per hectare including input uses to measure more specifically as in the productivity measure.	Issue has been addressed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	As mentioned earlier, general discussions seem to be lengthy, there needs to be prioritized and focused on the objective specific analysis. Authors need to highlight only those parts which are relevant and need for the analysis of the study. It will be better to highlight more econometric results and their diagnosis tests rather than simple descriptive statistics in the results and discussions, including the limitation of the data.	Properly done.

Reviewer Details	Anonymous reviewer, Reviewer does not want to reveal his/her identity
------------------	---