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 (*Heteroligus* spp.) 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**INTRODUCTION** The INTRODUCTION section is very long but contains mostly the cultural significance of Yam, which is not the point for discussion given the focus of the paper. The uses and cultural significance of Yam should be reduced to a paragraph of just about 3 to 4 sentences. Ideally, it should be focusing on the economic importance of yam, the challenges of yam production in Nigeria, the various coping strategies practiced by farmers and their effectiveness as reported in similar studies, the research problem and the objectives of the paper. The problem statement and the objectives of the paper should be embedded under the INTRODUCTION and should not stand alone. This will avoid repetition as seen in the concluding part of the INTRODUCTION and the First paragraph of the PROBLEM STATEMENT. **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY** The write up on the study area is too lengthy and should be summarised focusing on the location of the area, population and key economic activities. Report Methodology in past tense (Author should go through this section well and change all the tenses to past tense).	

	The first sentence should read as "The study was conducted in Delta State" and not the other way round. **Sampling Procedure and Sample size** The author(s) mention(s) that random sampling was used in the selection of respondents. How could you use random sampling when you are interested in a particular group of farmers (Yam farmers)? The multi-stage approach should have first included a purposive sampling of yam production zones, then a random sampling for the selection of the individual yam producers. Author(s) should clarify else it flaws the entire research approach. **Analysis** All farmers surveyed used one coping strategy or the other and so how come the OLS was used in the regression analysis? The dependent variable used in the analysis was not spelt out. The paper kept mentioning "coping strategies" as the dependent variable but which of them? How was the dependent variable measured? The coping strategies were more than one. Moreso, the responses were categorical (Yes (1) or No(0)) and hence OLS was not the right method to use. Let us assume the dependent variable was one categorical variable like coping strategy=1; No coping strategy=0. Then if that was the case a logit or probit model should have been used. And if the dependent variable was all the 6 coping strategies mentioned, then the Multivariate Probit (MVPROBIT) should have been used. Lastly even if the coping strategies were numbered as 1, 2…5, the OLS could still not be used because, what would be the basis	

	of giving a variable 1 and one 6? In this instance, the Ordered Probit/Logit would have also been the best approach. The use of OLS is entirely a wrong analytical approach given the categorical nature of the dependent variable and hence the author(s) should take a critical look at their data and analysis once again. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** Author(s) should revise the analytical approach and incorporate changes in the Results and Discussion section under the Regression analysis appropriately **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION** Revise conclusion and recommendations based on the changes in the methodology and discussion sections. **REFERENCES** NPC (2006), Inoni (2013) are not in the bibliography list. Ike, P.C and Inoni, O.E. (2006) in the bibliography cannot be found in the text. The use of Wikipedia as a reference source should be taken out. Wikipedia is not an academic portal and hence author(s) should instead cite the name of the scholars and place of publication, plus the URL address.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**ABSTRACT and INTRODUCTION** Report abstract in past tense. Example, Last sentence, However, from the findings…… Also Line 7 in the abstract should be rephrased in "Most of the farmers……..*farms*…." instead of *farmers* Describing Socio Economic Characteristics is not an objective. It is one of the sections that every paper should contain so making it as an objective should be taken out. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** Socio Economic Characteristics….. Is the difference between male and female farmers significant to conclude that female farmers are more actively involved in yam production? In Line 4, author(s) make reference to findings supported by many scholars hence does not provide a couple of those studies. It is important to compare results with previous related studies. Author(s) should separate the economic loss discussion from the socio economic characteristics discussion. It should be a sub heading on its own. If there is a way of presenting the coping strategies to know the combination of strategies practiced by farmers, it will be interesting. In Table 5, check the significance levels properly. Some are higher than others.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The paper is interesting and if the changes are well incorporated it will be a very good paper to read. If the data will not support any rigorous analysis, author(s) can focus on a detailed qualitative analysis of the coping strategies and economic losses. That could also be interesting.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Science and Technology Policy Research Institute, Ghana**