



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37645
Title of the Manuscript:	GENDER ROLE OF WOMEN IN FISHERIES OPERATIONS IN THE FISHING COMMUNITIES OF DOMA DAM OF DOMA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF NASARAWA 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Dear author(s), This is an interesting research article. However, several questions were raised and suggestions were provided in order to enhance the quality of the paper as follows: 1. The title needs minor modification; please delete the word 'Gender'. 2. The findings in the abstract should be general findings and summarised them. 3. Line 36-40 should be supported by relevant sources. 4. Lines 57-50 needs relevant literature to support the argument. 5. This manuscript suffers with theoretical background, and relevant recent literatures on fisheries development in both developed and developing countries. 6. The map is not clear and tries to find other map. 7. Sub-themes in the manuscript need to rephrase and rewrite as I found some misleading sentences. 8. The data collection methods are poorly explained. 9. The findings are Okay! 10. The discussions need rigour explanation based on the previous literature. 11. What are limitations of this study? 12. Suggestions for future research? 13. There are many technical errors as well as grammatical errors; I suggest the manuscript should be sent to professional proof-reader for further language checking. 14. The references should be followed APA 6th edition. Good Luck! As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper. Kindly see the following link: http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20	NOTED
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		