

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_105066
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS AFFECTING SMALLHOLDER FARMERS PARTICIPATION IN SESAME SEED MARKETING IN DOMA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, NASARAWA STATE
Type of the Article	Original research

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is adequate. It mentions the objective of this study, then the methodology followed, then the results, and ends with implications. Needs proofreading [see suggestions] Keywords are adequate</p> <p>The introduction is adequate and validated with reported research or references to validate the concepts. Overall, this section is adequate to build on the next parts of the research with clarity of purpose. Add how is this paper divided. The methodology is adequate, clear, and streamlined. Some proofreading and comments are suggested. Besides, there is an important suggestion for the paper to support its reliability [see suggestion including its validation with references, marked at the end of the paper]. The results are clear, with adequate data tables. Good to support the discussion. However, watch for the correction of the Symbol for Pearson's R [not P, which confuses the interpretation]. See details as comments. The discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. It is validated by the reported literature. However, needs proofreading and editing [see suggestions in the attached Manuscript] The conclusion is adequate. Limitations are not reported??? Must add Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements [I helped here to find the right references as you observe in the red-marked ones]. The last ones are proposed/suggested addition to support the reliability of your study. You need to add the references that are needed to support your work as well in some sections throughout the paper, marked in the text as comments</p> <p>Proofreading is needed [see suggestions]</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon