

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_89890
Title of the Manuscript:	TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY OF CASSAVA FEMALE FARMERS IN SURULERE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OYO 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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Provide a detailed description of data used in the collected and analysed study for the current topic "Technical Efficiency of Cassava Female Farmers in Surulere Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria".</p> <p>Methods: Please explain how could use the current model correctly by providing real examples.</p> <p><i>The authors should consider the following seriously:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract has a grammatical mistake. 2. Abstract is not focused. 3. Rationale for using dynamic population dynamics and investments is not properly spelt out. 4. At the end of the introduction the author should spell out the sections with numbers. 5. Some intuitive graphs or scattered plots may be presented in the introductory section to motivate readers to justify the linkages between population dynamics and investments. 6. Section numbering is not done and subsections are not mentioned with numbers. 7. The organization is slightly scattered and needs more discipline. <p>The author can provide a solid statistical theoretical basis that the item is not deleted because the purpose of your research is to build a model. If the instrument is not statistically valid, then your further built model is not fit.</p> <p>In my opinion, even though an instrument has a very established theoretical basis, in reality, the factor loading value did not prove, to meet the requirements, so it should be removed, because it could be, it will be the difference between your research and other research, right?</p> <p>The manuscript is weak. The Methodological details are missing. Thus, I recommend a major revision</p> <p><i>My specific comment follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author needs to give a detailed analysis of all the methods. 2. Little more detailed analysis of policy implications. <p>The interpretation is not sufficient as the authors need to test the effect of the proposed relationships and thus come out with meaningful conclusions.</p> <p>I believe that the paper in its current form has fewer contributions.</p> <p>The interpretation needs revisions as well.</p> <p>Please make sure that all references are cited in the text.</p> <p>There are serious problems with the method of the study.</p> <p>I mentioned it in detail in the referee report.</p> <p>Thus, all macroeconomic data are expected to be subjected to a unit root test first to determine their stationarity.</p> <p>If data are found not to be stationary at all, then there is no need to regress them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors need to give a brief description of relevant theories. • State the equation did not describe the method used. • The empirical part of this paper may need to be strengthened. <p>Moreover, the findings of the study have not been fully explained. After the problems in the method are resolved, the new findings to be obtained should be rewritten by comparing them with the findings in the literature.</p> <p>Interpretation should be more satisfying and persuasive.</p> <p>The methods need to be specific and chosen according to real and correct hypotheses.</p> <p>The conclusion section still does not improve well according to the data analysis. Please develop it as should as be.</p> <p><i>However, the authors should consider some issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author needs to do more thorough work on the literature. • The authors did not use a multiple linear regression model. • The authors have to understand from the mathematical point of view and must introduce the graphical representations of the input data and the obtained results for all hypotheses. • The mathematical modelling must be introduced to introduce for all readers all aspects, which characterize a regression analysis. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results should compare with other approaches, other than linear regression.• This study could provide the opportunity and space for authors and researchers from various other countries to conduct other studies in the same field based on this study and its results. <p><i>The authors should also consider the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• English writing ability needs to be strengthened.• Except otherwise stated, all regressing macroeconomic data that are not stationary can result in a spurious result, which can be misleading in policy direction.• I recommend the authors present the novelty of this research compared to previous research.• It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research.• Language editing is mandatorily required to improve the quality of the paper.• References should be written in a unified format.• The authors must develop conclusions.• The hypotheses of the study are sound, correct and logical, but the authors can formulate them more clearly and broadly.• The literature section is missing in the study. This section should be written directly after the introduction section and should contain a large number of related previous studies.• The state the equation describing the method used and noticed that is still weak.• The study variables used in descriptive statistics are correct and sound and provide a statistical and logical description of the study problem.• There is a need to improve on the literature. <p><i>Authors should consider the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Language editing and proof reading is highly recommended for academic writing2. if the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader3. It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications.4. Further, it is suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policy makers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties. <p><i>The paper needs a real revision as per comments which mentioned above.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, I have here few observations:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. justification of study is missing.2. literature review needs up-gradation.3. Some papers relating to the topic and subject of the study can be added.4. Update references from 2017 to 2022. <p><i>There are missing parts in the study (Ethics and Editorial Policies), such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional Information• Authorship (Author Contributions)• Data Deposition• Declarations Section• Raw Data• Related Works• Reporting Standards• Statistical Resources	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	<p><i>The authors should cite and consider these following papers to the current study:</i></p> <p>Aboki, E., Jongur, A. A. U., Onu, J. I. and Umaru, I. I. (2013). Analysis of technical, economic and allocative efficiencies of cassava production in Taraba State, Nigeria. <i>IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science</i>, 5(3): 19-26.</p> <p>Agada, M. O., Onuche, F. I. and Mbah, E. N. (2018). Gender participation and constraints in cassava production, processing and marketing in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. <i>International Journal of Gender and Women's Studies</i>, 6(1): 79-87.</p> <p>Akerele, E. O., Odojukan, D. M., Yangomodou, O. D., Olugbemi, M. T., Solana, O. I., Ilori, A. R. and Fadipe, M. O. (2019). Productivity and technical efficiency of cassava production in Ogun State, Nigeria. <i>IOSR Journal of Agric. and Veterinary Science</i>, 12(11): 33-40.</p> <p>Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1995). A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data. <i>Empirical Economics</i>, 20: 325-332.</p> <p>Croppenstedt, A., Goldstein, M. and Rosas, N. (2013). Gender and agriculture: Inefficiencies, segregation, and low productivity traps. Policy Res. Working Paper, No.6370, the WB</p> <p>Elisha, W. J., Oladimeji, Y. U. and Ouagbabe, O. O. (2020). Analysis of gender differential in profitability and accessibility to productive resources for strawberry (<i>Fragaria chiloensis</i>) production in Plateau State, Nigeria. <i>Agric. Econ and Ext Res. Studies Journal</i>, 8(1): 63-73.</p> <p>Nwaobiala, C. U. and Isaac, C. A. (2017). Farmers' perception on improved cassava varieties cultivated in Abia state, Nigeria. <i>The Nigerian Agricultural Journal</i>, 48(2): 275-283.</p> <p>Orewa, S. I. and Izekor, O. B. (2012). Technical efficiency analysis of yam production in Edo state: a stochastic frontier approach. <i>Int J. of Dev and Sustainability</i>, 1(2): 516 – 526.</p> <p>Peterman, A., Behrman, J. and Quisumbing A. R. (2010). A review of empirical evidence on gender differences in non-land agricultural inputs, technology, and services in developing countries. <i>IFPRI Discussion Paper 00975</i>. Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division (PHND). Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.</p> <p>Timothy, A. T. and Adeoti, A. L. (2006). Gender inequalities and economic efficiency: new evidence from cassava-based farm holdings in rural south- western Nigeria. <i>African development review</i>, 18 (3), 428–443.</p> <p>WB/FAO/IFAD (2009). World Bank/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/International Fund for Agricultural Development. <i>Gender and Agriculture: Sourcebook</i>. Washington, D.C.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p><i>Comments to authors: (Additional Evaluation)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript requires a professional language revision (proofreading). 2. The authors must follow the publishing rules and the editorial policies of this journal well, and adjust the manuscript according to the rules of this journal and in an orderly manner. 3. The manuscript is within the scope of the journal. 4. It is preferable to separate the study literature from the hypotheses and to make each of them in its part. 5. It is preferable to support and strengthen the introduction better than that, and the focus must be on clarification more. 6. It is better to link references at the beginning of the paragraphs rather than at the end. 7. The hypotheses of the study are laid down systematically and in a logical sequence, and they should be clear and readable for the readers. 8. In the methods section, we must focus on the most important terrorist incidents that took place in the period mentioned in the study. 9. The most important causes and factors that led to such incidents must be clarified and the possible means to properly control them. 10. In my opinion, the authors of this study can make appropriate recommendations based on the findings of the study they reached. 11. The econometric model used in the study to achieve its objectives is a good and appropriate model for the study, through which more results can be settled if the authors set more research variables than the current ones. 12. In the Future Studies section, it is important to have an explanation of major and important reasons for conducting future studies on this topic for the current study. 13. Authors must support their recommendations in this part after adding them in the study and direct them to other researchers to conduct this study in world-leading universities and institutes and to be at the center of their interests. 14. Researchers need to update the development of these theories. 15. The novelty of the study should be indicated in a special section at the end of the study after the conclusions section. 16. The theories of the study are still not clear and need more explanations. 17. The study was incorrect organized and needs to be organized well. 18. Language editing and proofreading are highly recommended for academic writing. 19. If the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader 20. It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications. 21. Further, it is suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policymakers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties. 22. The justification of the study is missing. 23. Literature review needs up-gradation. 24. Some papers relating to the Journal can be added in the literature review section. 25. The references must be updated. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>None.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nemer Badwan
Department, University & Country	Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, Palestine