



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_43305
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF COOKING ENERGY PREFERENCE AMONG HOUSEHOLD IN JOS NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, PLATEAU STATE
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The results of the paper could be used to inform policy makers on the issue of provision of energy. The paper therefore lacks some vital information. For example, the author (s) made reference to many policies being implemented to decrease household wood-energy consumption to substitute it by alternative conversional fuels. However, the author (s) could not make reference to a specific policy or section of that policy document (s). On the other hand the author (s) made recommendation that the government should come-up with strategies to reduce overreliance of households on the use of hard fuel. I found these to be contradictory statements because government policies will have strategies to be put in place.</p> <p>Clearly more information/clarity is needed in this paper. For example, the author (s) made statement about the socio-economic status threshold of households, which was not mentioned or explained.</p> <p>Source (s) of energy prices not provided</p> <p>In 2006 the population of the study area was 850 000, and in 2017 it is estimated to be 472,086. These figure are conflicting. Why should there be huge drop?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The specific policies implemented by government in a bid to enhance efficient energy use and reduce the overreliance of households on the use of hard fuel are now included.</li> <li>2. Sources of energy prices were gotten from field survey by the authors.</li> <li>3. There was a mix up in the population of the study area which is now corrected.</li> </ol> <p>NOTE: The corrected areas in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		