



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The title of the article could be rephrased as suggested to avoid ambiguity and ease the understanding of the concerns of the research. 2. The abstract could be rephrased in simple English to reflect the findings of the research. Conclusions should be reflected and recommendations broadened. 3. Literature review could be improved especially in drawing the relationship between production and gender. 4. The sampling procedure could be more articulate and easy to understand. 5. The meanings of ADP and OSADEP should be reflect somewhere in the article. 6. The implicit and explicit forms of the Cobb-Douglas Function could be stated. 7. Conclusion and recommendations could be enhanced and be drawn from specific findings of the research. 8. Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 could be presented without the borders like tables 5, 6 and 7.	1. Suggested title adhered to. 2. Rephrased abstract 3. This had been achieved under theoretical framework 4. Sampling procedure adjusted 5. The meaning had been supplied 6. The issue of implicit and explicit forms was expressed under theoretical framework. 7. done 8. tables well presented.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Other minor comments, observations, and suggestions in colour and comment boxes could be observed if found necessary.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article should be accepted for publication after corrections. All in-text references were properly acknowledged. Percentage calculations in the tables presented are correct. The research has contributed to knowledge in the area considered and could serve as a source of reference for other articles and research.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ekenta, Cornelius Michael
Department, University & Country	Department of Agricultural Extension and Management, Kabba College of Agriculture, Division of Agricultural Colleges – Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria - Nigeria