



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		
Minor REVISION comments	In your regression analysis, why is it that access to credit and household size has negative effect on ginger production contrary to apriori expectation? Secondly, the R^2 at 52% is too low. It shows that the explanatory variables lack explanatory power or there could be a problem of multicollinearity. You need to clean up the data or do some necessary adjustment to improve the value of the Coefficient of Determination, R^2. In line 169, you said that Y = Adoption of premier hybrid maize seed. One wonders whether you are still discussing the ginger research.	Because as house hold size increase ginger production decrease which is not supposed to be so. It is been expected that the larger the household size the more free farm labour available to the farmer which will consequently increase production of ginger. For credit implies that low access to credit will increase ginger production which is not supposed to be so. The expectation is that the more access to credit the more increase in ginger production. That is why they have negative effect. And for value of R^2 is 50.2% not 52% this is because the result obtained from multiple regression analysis method using SPSS indicates that all the socio-economic variables included in the model shows that 50.2% of the variability affect ginger production in the study area while 49.8% of the variable do not affect ginger production in the study area. I believe it is well



SDI Review Form 1.6

		explained there nothing like multicollinearity. In line 169 Y= Yield of ginger (kg/ha) have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	You need to edit the following: 1. Line 45 – ginger was introduced to Nigeria in 1972 but line 54 says that by 1959, 1,582.8 tons were exported. 2. Line 91 – The objective of the study is to identify the socio-economic characteristics of ginger production. It should be the socio economic characteristics of ginger farmers. 3. Line 109: the dry season is between March and October. That is not correct. March to October is the rainy season. 4. Line 187: The socio-economic characteristics of ginger farmers, not production. 5. Line 255 – other occupation 70% is too broad. The other occupation should be further broken down into its constituent parts. 6. Line 358 - , the cost of ginger production is N67,037 per hectare which constitutes about 22% of the total cost of production. Is that the cost of ginger seed or the cost of labour? 7. Table 4.12 is not aligned. 8. Line 420 – The reference on Adebisi, BK (1997) is not complete.	It was a typing error which I have corrected. Its 1927. Line 91 has been corrected and line 109 was a typing error is from March to October In the study area we have other occupation apart from farming. So those that have other occupation apart from farming are being classify under others for example some are civil servant traders, transporter, pastors etc are I think there is no need for further splitting into its constituent part because it is well explain in the manuscript. Line 358 has been corrected same goes to table 4.12. line 420 was completely erase it was error