



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>The abstract need to be reorganized. the information on methodology in the abstract should be summarized. The conclusion is weak and not sharp.</p> <p>The problem statement is not clear. Is the writer trying to relate productivity to environmental degradation or the writer is just interested in determining the determinants of agricultural productivity. If it is on productivity which crop is understudy or multiple of crops. I am not seeing what the problem is.</p> <p>The methodology is also very weak. The models are not well stated and specified. This section needs serious rework if this work is to be recommended for publication.</p> <p>Hence it is difficult to make any meaning from the results. I am not able to relate the methodology to the results.</p>	<p>Abstract has been re-organized</p> <p>Problem statement and justification has been stated clearly</p> <p>The methodology has been corrected</p> <p>Result has been corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	There are grammatical errors and formatting errors.	Grammatical errors have been corrected
Optional/General comments	The work needs serious revision before it can be recommended for publication	

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)	