



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_17041
Title of the Manuscript:	YAM FARMERS' COPING STRATEGIES AGAINST YAM BEETLE (<i>Heteroligus spp.</i>) IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA: IMPLICATION FOR FOOD SECURITY
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	1. I would reorganize and rename the methodological part calling it: "Material and methods". Then instead "Research Methodology" I propose a name: "Study area", and finally "Sampling Procedure and Sample Size" would rename into: "Data sources and the method description". 2. In table 1 variables "Marital Status" and "Educational Background" have only 215 responses, instead 225, consequently the total percentage for this variable should give 100%. 3. All references based on wikipedia from line 332 to 343 and citations from line 33 to 36 should be reorganized. For FAO, World Bank reports as well as for journal publications their original and not wikipedia origin should be shown. Then all these references should be properly cited in the text. 4. „Conclusion and Recommendation” – I would resign from recommendation part and call this part simply "Conclusions". The two recommendations given at the end of the text are a kind of general wish and do not generate any scientifically valuable information. There is a need to develop this conclusion part, especially answer what are the real implications for food security in the Delta State, but also in the whole Nigeria based on the achieved results. The author/s say that yam production will be improved/increased, but the real mechanism of this improvement is not clarified. Some other factors like climate change or demographic prospects should be also taken into account when formulating final conclusions. 5. The English language is good and needs only very few and minor corrections.	1. In agricultural economics and extension, we don't use materials and methods. Rather, we call this section "Research Method or Methodology". This is a survey study, not experimental research like the ones in Agronomy, Animal science and Forestry departments. 2. This has been corrected. 3. This has been done. 4. Other reviewers deemed this sub-title fit. The study only covers Delta state, not the whole Nigeria, so results cannot be generalised. The real mechanism is when yam farmers used effective coping strategies as stated in the concluding part of the study. I was concerned with coping strategies and factors influencing this. The fact that the R^2 was high suggests that those factors influencing coping strategies were significant. Moreover it is not possible to list all the factors, all other factors like climate change etc you mentioned were compounded into the error term. 5. Thank you sir, the minor corrections have been



SDI Review Form 1.6

		effected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Lines 40-42 – I would recommend to delete the sentence as similar one was already mentioned in lines 34-36. 2. Line 64 – Sentence with “alkaloids of saponin and sapogenin” is not clear. Saponins and sapogenins are not alkaloids. 3. Lines 65-78 – This description (from sentence starting from: “Ritualism...”) of social aspects connected with yam cultivation although quite interesting, however is rather far away from the main concept of this article. I recommend to delete this fragment. 4. Lines 88-93. These sentences are repeated in lines 102-106. Within one of these sentences there is a citation: Inoni (2013).. which is not present in the reference list. I recommend to delete all the sentences from lines 88-93. 5. Line 185 – Instead “Ogungbile, Rahman and Tabo (2002)” better to use “Ogungbile et al.(2002)”. 6. Lines 231-233 - There is no need to repeat the formula of hypothesis as it is already revealed in lines 118-120. I recommend to delete this fragment. 7. Line 234 - Instead “the influence some selected..” should be “the influence of some selected..”. 8. Line 284 – FAO (2009). FAO Statistic.. This reference should be more precise. 9. Lines 286-288 - The reference: Ike, P. C. and Inoni, O. E. (2006) is not cited in the text.	1. Done. 2. Saponins and sapogenins have been expunged as they are not alkaloids. Thank you fot this observation. 3. Deleted. 4. This has been done. Inoni (2013) suppose to be 2010. 5. Done. 6. This fragment has been deleted. 7. Corrected. 8. This was how I saw it in the reference material used. 9. Omission, now cited in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	