



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_18104
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF WOMEN IN LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR ECONOMIC EMPOWEREMENT IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the 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 <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	Introduction The introductory part of the research work is quite informative. However, the reference is somehow limited and narrow view. The author may wish to add some other points from the literature but if he/she chooses to leave it to leave it the way it is then it is equally welcome. Methodology The Study Area: The description of the study area is somewhat too long Sampling: The basis on which the choice of the sampling methods was based was not adequately described. Analysis: The economic analytical tool with which the relationship that exist between the variables identified in the topic and the objective of the study such as the training needs, assessment and economic empowerment and how the significance level of such parameters in the livestock production among women	I have added some references In agricultural extension, study areas are usually described in detail so that anybody reading the area of study can understand. I have also tried to explain the sampling method in the body of the text. Chi-square analysis was use to text the relationship that exist between personal characteristics and training needs of women.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	as investigated were not stated. Instead of this the author has only succeeded in telling us only the descriptive statistics through measures of only central tendencies aspects of the data collected which in real sense are not enough to describe economic assessment and other variables stated. Results and Discussions This section of the study is too bogus and ambiguous for easy understanding of the readers especially the laymen with little or no expertise in this field of science. The analysis of how the training needs of the women has impacted on the production of the livestock and the overall economic empowerment factor as stated in the objective. If these have been done, it would have shown the impacts on the output that is level of livestock production among the women as investigated among the women in the study area. Conclusion and Recommendation This aspect of the study is basically premised on the preempted opinion formed probably on similar study but definitely not the study in context as there was neither scientific nor economic proof to substantiate the acclaimed results so far based only on descriptive	The study only assessed the training needs of women and tried to look at the likely implication (positive or negative) on the social status and economic empowerment of women. The study is not an impact assessment study but is only recommending the assistance that women will need to increase their livestock production since they need the government for major assistance.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	statistics. Descriptive statistics through measure of central tendencies is not enough to prove the objectives of the study as stated in the introductory part of the study. The relationship between the extant practice among the women in rearing livestock and the results or impacts of the training needs and economic empowerment is necessary to give the study an academic look rather than common write up as it presently looks.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Furthermore, some minor grammatical corrections are needed few of which are stated below with the respective lines in which such sentences or words are found. Line 8: was use was written twice Line 20: Boast was used instead of boost Line 40: The author is not clear as to if he means 32% of the GDP or growth rate of the GDP as the two are separate words Line 47: relevance not relevant as used Line 85: Descriptive statistics not description statistics.	These has been corrcted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall Comment The paper I will suggest be critically looked into while the author should come up with a model that will analyze carefully the identified variables in such a way that the relationship among such variables will be established and the results are presented as concise as possible as against the current bogus presentation.	This paper is completely the result of a survey that describe findings from the field and does not need any model like in the field of agricultural economics.