



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24444
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF QUANTITY OF SHEA NUT COLLECTED AND PROCESSED BY THE PROCESSORS OF IMPROVED SHEA NUT PROCESSING TECHNOLOGIES IN NIGER STATE, NIGERIA
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 (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	Title: The title of the paper is too long and the author should see how best he condensed the title. Abstract: Give a brief summary of your abstract, and you have too many words. The wording of abstract should not be more than 200 words or at most 250 words. You have 352 words that are plentiful for an abstract. Furthermore, indicate 1 or 2 of your results in the abstract. It is not plausible to explain the whole of your results in the abstract. Keywords: In any scientific research you must have key words for your write-up. The keywords should be stemmed from the title of your work. There are no keywords-missing-indicate keywords below the abstract. Conclude your research findings before making any constructive recommendations. Line 366 to 369 should be your conclusion at the bottom of your abstract before recommendation. Methodology: Downsize your methodology section and some of the sub-sections can be fused together. Line 136 delete is a repetition Line 141 and 145 can be incorporated in the methodology section. Results and Discussion: In the discussion of your results table 2 stands for all	The corrected aspected has been highlighted with yellow colour. In table 4 which you asked for more understanding of the interpretation has been removed. In the methodology, some of the words have been merged together The references has been checked to the best of my ability as well.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the results interpretation, it is not necessary to indicate again and again. The author should connect the variables paragraph by paragraph which is far better than repeating the same table 2 several times or over and over; this will make your paper monotonous. Furthermore in table 3 as the author few of the processors received trainings. What would be the implication, if processors continue to receive no trainings what will happen to the industry? Explain the implications? In line 235 tables 4: The result is not well presented 29.33% of processors used personal credit/saving not 38.88% which is for the family. Cross-check the paragraph once again for better interpretation. References: The author should cross-check the references once again to see that all the citations in the text are captured in the references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It can be a good paper provided all the comments are put on board. The paper has lots of information but all cannot be captured in one paper. The author can even craft two paper from this paper.	