

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_113514
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perception of Calotropis procera on the productivity of off-season sorghum (Sorghum durra) in Magoumai, Gawar and Laf (Far North Cameroon)
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript is important for the scientific community; however, it needs a detailed explanation of the two objectives including the operational indicators of 'perception'. It may also include an explanation on the 'importance of perception' and 'how it links to the fact'. - The title of the article is ok. - It would be better if the title also communicated about 'why perception' - It is ok; however, there are scopes to improve such as: the introduction section may include the research problem; a separate sub-section may be given on the indicators used and their rationale. - It may include the following, in addition to the points mentioned above: perception may also be looked at age and ethnicity perspective with appropriate scientific tools. Moreover, the conclusion section may be further specific, especially the last sentence may be further explained. The 5th line of the abstract says that the sample size is 346 and the Section 2.5 mentioned that the sample size is 345, which may be corrected. - Some of the references mentioned in text, but missing in 'References' at the end such as UNDP, 2002 and PCD Moutourwa 2014) - 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is ok. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Damodar Jena
Department, University & Country	KIIT School of Rural Management, KIIT University, India