



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_18105
Title of the Manuscript:	LEVEL AND DETERMINANTS OF WOMEN FARMERS ACCESS TO INFORMAL CREDIT IN ABIA STATE, 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The researcher should be keen on typological errors especially spacing of words that could change the meaning of not done well e.g couldjudiciously on page 7, hadno on pg 8, significantand pg 13 Justify the selection of twenty women from each community i.e. why twenty and not any other number Do the seven unreturned questionnaires affect the quality of the outcome? Check the percentage acceptable for data analysis when some questionnaires are not returned and justify why you had to continue with the analysis without their responses. The researcher should avoid journalistic language like a good percentage and instead state the percentage. Information on the number of financial institutions ready to offer credit needs to be include in the paper Because availability of credit is also an issue that has not been extensively considered. They may be willing to get credit and have the security and lack willing lenders. The conclusion is not conclusive more needs to be included.	The lack of spaces between words is not the authors mistake. Some words tend to join together when being sent via email. The words were not joined before being sent out. In case this occurs again after separation feel free to help us separate them. Twenty women were selected from each of the 12 communities because the authors wanted an adequate final sample size that is neither too small nor too large 7 out of 240 is 2.9% and judging by the large sample size (233 is greater than 30) we continued with analysis. The study was done with intent of being published in a journal so that was why it included journalistic language. Please the study must not cover all research gaps. That issue will be addressed in another study.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		