



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37136
Title of the Manuscript:	CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS EFFECT ON AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article (This is not an original research article, it is an article reviewing existing literature and utilizing secondary data to model)

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 Abstract To incorporate the proposed comments Put the full meanings of the acronyms when used for the first time and continue to use the acronym thereafter. To change the term study in the whole article to this article as it is not a typical research study but an analysis of existing scenarios Section 1.1; To identify suitable subheadings for the section to fit the kind of literature thereunder, Otherwise the section is too long unless this is done. Citation/references. Use <i>et al</i> in the text where there are multiple authors and transfer the actual name to the relevant section at the end of the article Ensure you capture all references in both the text and the reference section Scholars must respect information sourced from others by citing them appropriately Language: TO expunge those terms and use acceptable scholarly terminology There need to connect concepts in an article so that it makes linguistic meaning and communicates the scientist or other facts. To correct the tenses, Introduce some connective terminology to ensure the there is flow of concepts and ideas in the whole article. To correct all the formatting and content areas as advised	Abstract: A typical abstract to comprise of a synopsis of the whole article. This should be under as short background, objectives in this case, the data saucing procedures (analysis of secondary data) analytical methods, results, conclusions and recommendations Language in the abstract: The use of ACRONYMS for terms that are not universally known (like UN) for the first time in this case ARDL and NIMET should be accompanied with their actual meaning. On reading the abstract and the whole article I am of the opinion that the this is an article reviewed and not a study Section 1.1: This could have been the introduction of the article, giving a background of the concepts under review. The heading thus should change to Introduction; which should merge into the motivation of the review and not motivation of the study. The section is too long unless it is subdivided in o subheadings Citation/references Citations do not reflect the international norms. For instance where there are multiple authors, in the text, it is recommended you use <i>et al</i>. And details of all authors are only indicated in the reference at the end of the article. Some references in the text do not feature in the reference section and vice versa like Federal ministry of agriculture and rural development, NIMET, 2017; FMARD, 2016; NEMA, 2013) There are some facts that the author communicates that are definitely sourced from certain authorities yet they are not cited. Language: There is unconventional use of terminology in the whole article. E.g.: the use of such terms that do not reflect scholarly works' faces, in fact, etc., claimed, unfair, disclosed argued, pathetic, warned, subsistent Lack of connectivity and flow in the article, some statements pop up from nowhere e.g. last statement last statement under paragraph 4.1 and last statement in section 2.1. A lot of assumption made that the reader will just understand the contents without consideration of what is in the authors mind like what does a statement <i>Most farmers' plant only for their personal consumption</i> mean? I am, sure the author means <i>Most farmers grow crops for local/household consumption. Or However, with whether prediction for 2017 by NIMET (2017), achieving these objectives remains a concern; This means stakeholders can rely on it,,, rely on it for what? who are the stake holders. A little detail missed out in this statements assumed by the author that the reader will interpret e.g. Page 8, the use of the term 'They' who are 'they'?</i> The careless use of tenses that is not suitable in some situations e.g. Formatting and content of some sections There some inconsistencies in the formatting. e.g. The use of the feature % and percentage in the article, Capital letters pop up in wrong places in the statements like under the headings of Table where the crucial words like Where, Were . These are careless mistakes not expected from a scholar and an article should not be sent fro review with such! In numbering sections, I notice the following: 1.1; 2.1; 3.1; and 4.1... Where is 1.0; 2.0; 3.0; 1nd 4.0.? For instance at 2.1, introduce 2.0, a short description of what the whole section is all about. Otherwise that is not conventional numbering Section 2.2 has terminology that seem to refer to geographical regions in Nigeria but the author assumes that the reader will decipher this.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Make it clear that the ADO EKITI MAKURDI GUSAU are either provinces, or counties or states whichever is applicable Make it clear. The article seems to refer to short to mid-term fluctuations in climate variables of rainfall temperature and CO2.	Context of the article There is a difference between climate change and climate variability especially in the context of timelines. One refers to the long term and the other to the shorter to mid-term phenomena ie, climate variability is a short-medium term fluctuations of climate variables around mean state on climate scales, is referred to as climate variability (IPCC, 2007). Climate change refers to the same but over a period of decades or longer. What is the author investigating? Is it climate change or climate variability? At one point the author indicates that secondary data was the source of data and when you read through the article it is so. However on page 10, suddenly there are 850 questionnaires. So was this an actual study interviewing the respondents or use of secondary data from document analysis? Some statements like on pg. 11: <i>Also the rise in temperature has positive effects on net revenue of farmers or The results show that CO2 emissions negatively affect traded and non-traded agricultural product.</i> These are superfluous and have no contextual meaning as mainstreamed on the theme of the article. Under conclusion, sunshine seems to be used to replace temperature. The two terms are not synonyms	
Minor REVISION comments	Results The first paragraph under section 5.1 is outlining a procedure and not the result. Some terminology should be explained first, e.g. what is Short-Run, Unit root test, Long-Run. These terms sound English, but they seem to have some other technical meaning in modelling. Therefore a short statement explaining what they are,, of what use etc, at the beginning of the sub-heading would do towards making the article understood.	
Optional/General comments The article is based on some good scholarly thematic area. However, the author should improve it by addressing all the indicated concerns	Overall, the purpose of publishing is to communicate outcomes to the scholarly community. This article should be understood. I would say In spite of being not an expert in modelling, I have not understood this article. This is because it lacks proper arrangement of content under appropriate headings that link each other hence there is no connectivity between concepts and ideas which affects understanding it ; and there are issues with the language of communication, English, where tenses are mixed, terms like , I, WE, PASSES, are used in an article amongst other linguistic challenges. Further it makes assumptions that the reader can decipher what the author wants to communicate and hence statements pop up that are not contextualized. The use of wrong tenses further compounds the problem of communication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beatrice Barasa
Department, University & Country	Department of Emergency Management Studies, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya