



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_28949
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIO ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF GINGER PRODUCTION IN JABA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE
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	1. All the study is based on an statistical study, but the sample chosen has not being verified as representative of the population formed by all the farmers dedicated to ginseng crops. There is no mention to the significance or any other statistical calculation. And it does not mention either in which period of time this study was carried out. 2. While doing the regression expression the Author does not give hints about how he manages to convert qualitative information in numerical data (gender, marital, status, etc.). 3. Furthermore there is no bibliography or references studies reviewed about the use of these methodologies in other socio-economic assessment in other parts of the world with ginseng or any other crops, not only in Nigeria. There is no justification of why this methodology is being use and why the author considered the most valuable and appropriate for the case of study. 4. Most of the references are from long ago. If there is an Annual Abstract of Statistical, it might be consider reviewing it from the past 10 or 20 years not from the sixties till the eighties. And if there is no such data it should be pointed out.	I cannot effect any of the correction here because I don't know what is call ginseng. My research was based on ginger not ginseng. And everything is well explained in the Manuscript I use micro excel to cod my data, after which i use SPSS software to run my analysis. My studies is based on ginger not Ginseng There are some reference that u cannot do without them because of the value information they contained.
Minor REVISION comments	There are a few minor aspects that should be reviewed or re-written that I have categorized in 2: a) content and references, b) English and format.	There is no need for that



SDI Review Form 1.6

	a.1) The Abstract gives too much information about the plant which is not useful information about the study <i>per se</i>. In my opinion this should be only present at the Introduction chapter. Therefore I would rather begin the abstract starting in line 14. a.2) Line 45- There is no reference on how it is known the ginseng to be introduced in 1972. a.3) Line 57- says “over the past 20 years” referring to data from sixties to eighties. For using such an expression the data should be updated since the nineties. a.4) Line63- “compared to another country” but there is no reference to such comparison, which countries are those? a.5) Line 65- “many problems” which problems, where is the reference? a.6) Line 101- There is a contradiction on the figures regarding to population 2006 and 2004. And in any case if there it has to be an introduction of demography situation in the region and there is no updated data this should be pointed out and use estimation with the growth rate. a.7) Line 121 – Review scientific references of edaphology types to clearly specify the soil type used a.8) Line 122- The expression “many others” fails to be accurate and lacks of references. If these are oral information extracted from the interviews should be pointed out.	I have corrected some while other are not corrected because there is no need for it. I
--	---	---

	a.9) Line 221 – considering reviewing the expression “can only be done by able men” it fails gender equality a.10) Line 263 – “all the farmers” is not accurate because in fact is just referred to those who were consulted and as I mention on the major reviews needed the sample lacks to be representative of all ginseng farmers a.11) Line 375- the percentage from the total of each cost is mentioned but not in this case. b.1) Line 26 – consider reviewing the English in this sentence, using perhaps implementation of extension services. b.2) Line 28 – what does the authors meant with the expression “good time” in here? b.3) Line 45- if Germany and France knew about ginseng in the 19th century, way before planted in Nigeria, why is mentioned after it? b.4) Line 110 – The reference to Temperature I supposed is to “mean temperature” and again the reference is not updated, is from 20 years’ time. b.5) Line 118- punctuation marks blank space. b.6) Lines 128 and 131 – if the study has being already done, the sentences most use the verbs in the past not in the future as in “will selected” or “will randomly selected” b.7) Line 234- considering reviewing English in the	believe my research work is ginger not Ginseng. It has been corrected and put in order. All he table are well corrected an aligned.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	expression "are might have" b.8) Line 247 and 295 - "e.tc" and "e.t.c." review punctuation marks b.9) Table 7 repeated, Table 4.10 and 4.12 review numbering b.10) Lines 373 and 374 review spaces between paragraphs b.11) Table 4.12 aligned correctly the columns cost and percentage with the variables. b.12) Consider reviewing English in the Conclusions paragraph.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion the lack of an statistical approach in the selection of the sample, considering the conclusions of the study is based on it, it should be addressed in order to be accepted	