



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	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 <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	1. Strict adherence to the template of the journal throughout the article 2. Revise the abstract and highlight the important points made in the paper (aim, study design, methodology, major results, and major conclusions) 3. Merging of Introduction with Literature Review and deleting the sub-title 1.1 background 4. Much of the information in the background is too general and serves no purpose in a scholarly article 5. The literature review is limited and there is need to beef it up with current literature on smallholders' livelihood security so as to contextualize the study within wider international discourse. 6. A map showing geographical location of the study area Zambezi region in Namibia is required 7. How was stratified random sampling approach applied? What was the target population? 8. It is not clear what type of data was tested y Chi-Square and how it was collected	• The template has been adhered to. • The background was deleted. • The literature was improved by adding the current sources. • A map of the study area was added. • Stratified sampling was also explained in terms of contextualizing it as suggested by the reviewer. • The nature of the data has been explained.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	9. Correction of all grammatical errors including spelling, formatting etc	The grammar was improved through editorial work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the theme discussed in this paper is adequate and satisfactory in form and content. However, the above compulsory comments should be addressed	Concerns that were raised were corrected.