

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99166
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Potentials of Plantain Value Addition in Improving Rural Households' Income in Ekiti State, Nigeria.</b>
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 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study is on the importance of plantain on improving the income for households in Ekiti state, Nigeria.</li> <li>The study did not have a clear background of the study. Eg. The current production of plantain in Ekiti state and the total income it generates for the households and how the average income for the households have increased due to the increase of plantain production over the years</li> <li>The study did not have clear research problem with its current research problem and how this study can help to mitigate the current research problem</li> <li>There is inadequate review of past literature on the relevant areas</li> <li>There is no clear reasoning given for the chosen product, that is "plantain" and why Ekiti state in Nigeria.</li> <li>Most of the paragraphs are without in-text citations, which should have as the statistical data must have been referenced from a source</li> <li>The list in the references list are mostly not in the content. Does not meet the references requirements</li> <li>The results obtained were not interpreted for easy reading and understanding. Mostly are reporting only</li> <li>Did not have clear writing on how the obtained results can be used to mitigate the current research problem by various stakeholders.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study is on the importance of plantain on improving the income for households in Ekiti state, Nigeria.</li> <li>The study did not have a clear background of the study. Eg. The current production of plantain in Ekiti state and the total income it generates for the households and how the average income for the households have increased due to the increase of plantain production over the years</li> <li>The study did not have clear research problem with its current research problem and how this study can help to mitigate the current research problem</li> <li>There is inadequate review of past literature on the relevant areas</li> <li>There is no clear reasoning given for the chosen product, that is "plantain" and why Ekiti state in Nigeria.</li> <li>Most of the paragraphs are without in-text citations, which should have as the statistical data must have been referenced from a source</li> <li>The list in the references list are mostly not in the content. Does not meet the references requirements</li> <li>The results obtained were not interpreted for easy reading and understanding. Mostly are reporting only</li> <li>Did not have clear writing on how the obtained results can be used to mitigate the current research problem by various stakeholders.</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chiam CC</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malaysia</b>