



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_12986
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF PRODUCTIVITY AMONG WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY: A CASE STUDY OF THE CASSAVA WOMEN FARMERS OF BENUE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, NIGERIA.
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In line 158, the total number of respondents that provided the data on marital status was 84 and not 87 as presented in the total Lines 193 to 197 stated that according to Umoh(2006), urban farming may not be only for satisfying the household's food need or subsistence. The farmers may be interested in selling their outputs to raise income. Thus, the farmers like any other entrepreneur would be interested in the profitability of the farm enterprise. For this reason, efforts were made to determine the cost associated with urban farming and also revenue that accrues to the farmers' efforts. Reading through the manuscript from introduction to this point, there was no argument or discussion on urban farming; I do not see any reason for the introduction of this topic at this point in the manuscript. The data presented in table 2, did not indicate the period of time or the size of the farm where the respondents generated the revenue and incurred the cost presented in the table.	1. The authors agree with the reviewers comments on line 158 and have affected the corrections. 2. Reviewer's comments on line 193-197 have been addressed sufficiently. 3. The data in table 2 and related issues have been treated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		