

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104602
Title of the Manuscript:	COWPEA MARKETING AND CONSUMPTION PREFERENCE IN POTISKUM LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF YOBE STATE, 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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><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>	<p>The manuscript is relevant since it provides information about the marketing aspect of cowpea. Which will contribute to the body of knowledge as to the marketability and profitability of cowpea.</p> <p>The title need to revised since the article did not provide and discuss about the consumption preference and it was not part of the objectives of the study.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, however the discussion of the results, conclusion and recommendation are missing. Please include in this article the discussion of the results, conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The author needs to add more recent study like 2020 or 2021 since the most recent study indicated in the article was 2014.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it was suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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>Nerisa N. Paladan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Graduate Studies and Research, Partido State University, Philippines</b>