



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11132
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS AFFECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF WOMEN IN INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES IN SABON-GARI LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA 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>)

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>)
--	---------------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) General, there is no enough bibliography. 2) There is no reliability in this research. In the chapter of the introduction, the author does not refer specific evidences for the employment of Nigerian women (e.g. age, educational level, economic sectors, e.t.c.). 3) Moreover, there is no information about the economy sector of the specific area (Kaduna State) such as information for the rural economy, service sector, number and category of small enterprises, etc.). 4) In addition, the survey does not refer evidences for the sample (sample selection criteria, economy sectors of the sample employment, information for the questions of the questionnaires and information for the collection procedure of them).	1. At least there are more than 10 references which should be enough for any paper. 2. Introduction should constitute the general background of the topic and I did that in my introduction. 3. Information on Kaduna State is stated in the methodology of the study. 4. Corrections on sample selection criteria have been effected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article needs to be rewritten and the reliability of the survey should be proved.	All the necessary corrections have been made and I believe with the other reviewers comments, the quality of the paper has improved.