



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_28619
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the Agricultural Livelihood Strategic Components in the Zambezi region, Namibia: A Chi-Square Test
Type of the Article	<u>Original research paper</u>

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Material and Methods • Results and Discussion • Conclusion	Material and Methods • The section captured 'material and methods' should simply read 'Methods' since materials are not evident here. • What research design was used? • The method itself needs thorough revision. There is the the claim that stratified sampling was used. What was the basis of stratification? Gender? Religion? Or Systems of farming? This must be stated. From each stratum, how many respondents were sampled? and what sampling technique was used to select the respondents? The method should tell readers the unit of data collection. Paper is also silent on the instruments for data collection. The paper is also somehow silent on how the data was analysed. Stating that Chi-square was used does not	• The word Material was removed and now only Methods remains • The questionnaire was stated as a tool for data collection, the issue about stratification was also corrected to reflect how it was done as based on environmental characteristics (flood plains), how data was analysed was corrected by including conventional descriptive statistics. The use of SPSS was also reflected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		address this concern. Was any computer-based software or electronic means (SPSS, EXCEL etc.) employed? These are critical methodological issues that the paper must address if it is to unleash. Note that a paper is as good as the method. Results and Discussion • Results and Discussion section leaves much to be desired. How significant are these findings? • Reference is made in the paper to the proportion (percentage) of respondent farmers and their output levels of crops and livestock for different periods. Strangely no table or graph is found in the work to summarise the distribution. • It is not appropriate to create a separate section for hypothesis testing as is evident in this manuscript. What should have been done is to state and discuss the test results in the test where they best fit. • The discussion bit is problematic. This requires the author to interpret/explain the findings or	• The results and discussion were improved. The descriptive results were also included. The section on hypotheses was removed and the content integrated.
--	--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		results in detail. What is the significance of these findings? What does the literature say in relation to the findings? In other words, explain your findings in the light of the available literature. I suggest that the discussion part is treated separately from the results. Conclusion • The last section should read ‘Conclusion and policy Recommendations and not ‘Concluding Remarks’. • A number of issues appeared for the first time in the conclusion. This is a problem as they are not borne out of the findings. Conclusions must be based on key findings. • The conclusion can then be followed with relevant policy recommendations.	• The conclusion and recommendations were changed and redrafted afresh in line with the findings as per reviewer’s comment.
--	--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor REVISION comments</u>	• Title • Abstract • Key words • Background	• The title should be revised to reflect the content of the paper. Since the Chi-square was only used to test the hypothesis and not the only statistical tool, I suggest that bit is excluded from the title of the paper. It is clear that the author used both inferential (chi-square) and descriptive (percentages) statistics. Why then the bias towards one approach. Title must be clear and concise. • Abstract needs to be revised to reflect the following: ➤ Aims ➤ Study design and Method used ➤ Key findings ➤ Recommendations ➤ Use of improved English What does 'parametric sampling' in the abstract mean? • Key words should be supplied beneath the abstract. • What appears as a sub-section of INTRODUCTION (i.e. 1.1 Background) should be deleted. Sections of the paper should flow this	• The title was modified with the removal of the statistical part of the title. • The abstract was revised. • All these issues were corrected where necessary. The grammar was also improved by editorial means. That means random sampling and remains technical language that was not changed. • Key words are reflected. • The background was deleted to accommodate the flow as suggested.
--	---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		way: abstract; Introduction; Literature Review; methods; Results; Discussion; Conclusion and Policy Recommendations.	
<u>Optional/General comments</u>		It is not very clear what the contribution of this paper is even though the author tried to unconvincingly demonstrate this in the last paragraph of the first section of the paper (i.e. Introduction: Background). The paper needs serious restructuring. It also needs proper editing to correct some grammatical mistakes. The standard of the English used in general needs improvement.	Editorial work was done. The flow is there as expected.