



SDI Review Form 1.6

In

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_42853
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRAINTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY IN KAINJI LAKE NATIONAL PARK, 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>)

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	<p>Abstract: The dependent variables for the developed regression equations must be defined (X_1, \dots, X_6)</p> <p>Introduction: The justification of the study has not been strongly and clearly given in the introduction. So, factors, conditions, literature necessitating the study should be given.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The specific information or data collected in the study has not been given, the author only mentioned the methods or tools used in data collection without given the specific data collected.</p> <p>Results/Discussion: the discussion in the article is completely missing, unless few shallow and weak comparisons with past studies were given in the results section.</p> <p>Recommendations: Most of the recommendations were not supported by the findings of the study, they are based on speculations which must be avoided in a research article, therefore must be re-written.</p>	<p>Abstract: the dependent variables have been defined</p> <p>Introduction: the statement of problem as well as Justification has been added to the reviewed copy. In the materials and methods, the specific information/ data collected have been included in the reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>Result and discussion was initially combined and has been modified</p> <p>One of the recommendations that doesn't correspond with the findings have been removed and the others modified to suit the findings</p>
Minor REVISION comments	The article need English and type setting editing (font size and spacing), also some vital references have not been given in the article.	The font sizes and spacing as well as more vital references have been worked upon and included in the reviewed manuscript
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	