



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_18889
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of the agro-net technology on management and financial profitability of cabbage and pepper production systems in Benin
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some literature was not been in reference Section (such as Tiamiyu, 2002; Adegbola et al., 2001; Adegbola et al., 2004; CIRAD). I think Net Income is not calculated truly. And instead of Benefit / Cost ratio author/s use relative profit.	Corrected. Reviewer is right making this important remark. In Table 3, there were data copying errors, and the gross revenue without insect nets was not correct (see table 4). Now, net income (or net revenue = gross revenue – total cost) is corrected. Ok, we now explain that the calculated benefit/cost ratio is the profit ratio, benefit standing here as the profit.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		