



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_29309
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterisation and challenges of melon farmers in Enugu Ezike Agricultural Zone of Enugu 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>)



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	Comments and suggestions for the authors: First of all I would like to commend the authors on pursuing a very interesting and timely topic, family farms in developing countries. However, I have some major considerations. The most important problem is that the study is mainly descriptive. No hypotheses have been made and proved. It lacks depth. 1. The "Background Information" section should be improved with more literature references and also with more information for supporting the background of the analysis. The authors should provide a theoretical framework that supports their hypothesis. The literature needs more discussions. Provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done and the area studied. A map of the area analyzed would be useful. 2. In the "Methodology" section there is no strong theory behind the methodology employed in this article. It will be necessary to improve the data analysis method with some extra data about the structured interviewed. The authors use a three point Likert-type scale (line 93) but they don't justify why, meanwhile in literature it is usually recommended between a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 8 point-scale. The factor analysis could have been improved using the relevant theory. Moreover, the authors do not cite any reference to support this kind of analysis. 3. In the "Results and Discussions" section, the results obtained should be explained in detail indicating whether the findings are congruent or incongruent with previous studies. Provide detailed interpretation of data. A great number of statements in the paper are not properly backed by references. For example: - Lines 107-108: "...This implies that the respondents were relatively young" Comparing with where? Where I live the average age of farmers is 45 and in this study is 52.6. "...and may accept new technology that will aid to boost melon production". Give references. "Which is not the case with aged farmers..." Age? - Lines 122-123: "Since the greater percentage of them were married, there	Hypothesis is not compulsory in research. Secondly you do not impose it in a research when it is not needed. Descriptive study is good because it provides straight knowledge and response to issues addressed in a simple manner thereby making agriculture research output available and useful to the ultimate users who are mainly illiterate farmers in the developing countries. This is not a thesis/project or opinion paper where you need theory/model to support or contradict your claim/view ---Factor analysis supported with reference -----Changed to modified Likert type scale. ----- It is good to compare findings with previous work done on related field but not a "must" The most important thing is to discuss it very well within the concern of the study and show-case lessons or implications of the finding.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	is possibility of employing family labor in melon production which reduces the cost of production". Give references that support such sentence. The authors should provide data about family workers and hired workers in the area studied. - Line 144: "...probably because of lack of interest and constraints associated with agriculture". Give references that support the statement. - Line 150: "this income is low especially for married people". Give references that support the statement. Moreover, the authors do not explain if this is the only income in the household. They should compare this income with the average wage in agriculture in the country or the minimum wage. In Table 1 the authors should give maximum and minimum values. About expenditure (lines 158-162 and Table 2), do authors mean costs or investment? Do they include wages? The authors should disaggregate them in order to know where farmers spend more or less and have more information about that. About income (lines 163-171 and Table 2), the authors say melon production is profitable (line 171), meanwhile in line 150 authors say this income is low. Moreover, Table 1 shows that mean MONTHLY income is 7,455.4 and Table 2 shows that mean ANNUAL income is the same amount. So that income is monthly or annual? About production site, the authors say that the respondents situated their farm away from their residence (lines 178-179) and explain the different places but not the causes in order to analyze if it would be convenience to avoid that or not and how to solve it. Perceived challenges of melon farmers (line 257): 3 factors were extracted as challenges facing melon farmers in the area. The authors should explain how they select the factors and the challenges, discuss the results and give references that support both the methodology and the results. 4. In the "Conclusion" section the authors point out that "melon production is profitable in spite of the fact that farmers employed traditional agronomic practices and sold their goods immediately after harvest at their homes" (lines 281-282). Do you mean that innovation in farming is not profitable? Give references that support such statement. The authors should include the recommendations into the conclusion section. The authors say that "innovations... should be communicated to these farmers..." (lines 286-287). Who? How? Apart from that, in the "Conclusion" section the authors should (1) explain and	I cannot understand your point of 45 years of farmers where you live and 52.6years in this study? Must their mean ages be the same? Please, this was outcome of research and one should not pre-empt research results. If everything about our discussion should be derived from references or other works of other authors. Where will we make input in the study so that other authors can cite our opinions or contributions -----Please profit and income are not synonymous ----I mean that if it is profitable with little or no input, a step further will maximise profit NB In spite of the responses above, I have made relevant corrections in the paper.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	discuss the implications of their findings for farmers and policy makers and (2) mention the limitations of this study. It seems like the study is only focused in a small non representative area. The authors should discuss more the limit of this study, and compare their results with those of similar ones conducted in other regions, if present.	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor points: Subsections should be numbered, as journal suggests in the authors' guidelines. 4-8 keywords should be given, as journal suggests in the authors' guidelines. References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets, as journal suggests in the authors' guidelines. The paper presents numerous grammatical and formatting errors. For example: - Line 37: no close brackets after 0.46%. - Line 50: "It" in capitals after a comma. - Line 58: a stop is used instead of a comma. - Line 67: no final stop. - Line 129: productivity. - Line 130: no final stop. - Line 123: the authors use "labor" and in line 137 "labour". - Line 150: not. - Line 220: weeedd. - Etc. In general, a Language revision is needed through the whole text.	Corrections have been made.
Optional/General comments	As I mention above, the most important problem of the paper is that it is mainly descriptive. No hypotheses have been made and proved. It lacks depth and the authors do not discuss the implications of their findings for farmers and policy makers and any implications for sustainable agricultural development.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedoain.org/archives/20>