



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_34738
Title of the Manuscript:	Social factors of derived savanna in northern Edo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	This paper describes Social factors of derived savanna in northern Edo State, Nigeria. However, I believe this paper may have potentials for publication if the authors can address a few of the major concerns that I have. My first main concern relates to the justification of the study. The authors need to do a better job of explaining why this study, in the material and methods section, I have no description and location of the study area, what are the climatic data during your collection period? What is the relationship between climate change and the number of doctors and teachers? The discussion in the light of recent findings is non-existent The conclusion also does not reflect your results.	Justification/why the study: further justification is provided Description and location of study area: Location description is provided. Climatic data during collection period: the study did not involve collection of climatic data. The status of Edo north that has changed from Rain Forest to derived savannah with associated climate data is well documented by authors dating back to Clayton (1961) to NDRDMP (2016). Relationship between climate change and number of doctors and teachers: there was no collection of climate data to relate with number of doctors and teachers. Conclusion: have improved on the conclusion
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		