

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_105801
Title of the Manuscript:	Contribution of sustainable Cocoa Production to Poverty Reduction in 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:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript can be useful for the scientific community and can help future research on this issue.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript should be revised based on items 7 to 10.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references mentioned in the article are not enough. New and relevant references should be added to the manuscript.</p> <p>7. The motivations of the study are not well presented.</p> <p>8. What are the existing solutions in the most relevant literature and their drawbacks or issues?</p> <p>9. What are the main criteria for data selection and time period of research?</p> <p>10. What are the disadvantages of your approach? What are the limitations of your research?</p> <p>11. Additional explanations and interpretations of Table 8 should be given.</p> <p>12. I suggest enhancing the last section (Conclusion) to better explain because the key results of the research should be expressed in more detail.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are a few grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Manuscript is suitable for the purposes of the journal.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Mojtaba Sedighi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran