



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_42393
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Analysis of Gari Processing Systems in Sierra Leone
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>)

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	- The manuscript examines Economic Analysis of Gari Processing Systems in Sierra Leone. The overall paper is defensible and the writing is generally clear. But, it is not well fitted in the current research. Several statements are not supported by references. - The manuscript has no testable hypothesis. There is no solid scientific discussion of the results in the manuscript.	- I think there are references on the introduction, method, and discussion of the draft paper. Please verify were I need to make additional reference for it to be well fitted. - I don't think it should have hypothesis with reference to the objectives and the PAM method use in doing the economic analysis. We are trying to evaluate our various Gari processing systems operating within Sierra Leone and recommend the most efficient one and to some extent examines it competitiveness. I could have stated an hypothesis if I included anything like relationship or trying to determine the effect in my objectives.
Minor REVISION comments		Thanks for the inputs. I am grateful.
Optional/General comments		