

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_125459
Title of the Manuscript:	A CHRONOLOGY OF NIGERIA'S AGRICULTURAL POLICIES AND THE RESULTING EFFECTS EVIDENCED IN DOCUMENTORIES
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> <p>This study interests me because it gives a breakdown of how the management of the agricultural sector in Nigeria began and how</p>	<p>This research interests me because it gives a breakdown of the management of the agricultural sector began in and it's evolution over time. It also goes to show how each regime impacted the lives of Nigerians through Agriculture. It also captures how the past government has handled the issue of Agriculture in time past.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article does not seem suitable, in my opinion. I would rather prefer – AGRICULTURAL POLICIES IN NIGERIA: IMPACT ON THE NIGERIAN ECONOMY</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract is comprehensive but too lengthy. First, an abstract should begin with the objective of the study before the methodology comes in. Findings should be clearly stated in a way that it can be easily spotted just like the conclusion. For example, the study found out that... Abstract should also have a recommendation at the end.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Manuscript is very well structured and articulated except that a conceptual framework/empirical review section has to be included after the introduction</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>First of all, the title should be “References” and not “Reference” . References should be listed using the same format. Some names appear in Italic form. References are sufficient for an article. References should either contain ISSN or not (uniformity should be applied). The study needs more if recent references (5-7years back). Most of the references are outdated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is appropriate and suitable for the scholarly community</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This research is fascinating and is a good contribution to the body of knowledge</p> <p>Abstract should begin with the general objective of the study before the methodology. After a detailed methodology, the findings of the study should be clearly stated (the study found out that) just like the conclusion. Findings should be stated in a way that it can be easily spotted, and should not be too lengthy. It can be stated in two to four sentences. Findings should sound more like a discovery than a discussion. Conclusion is well stated and concise. A recommendation should come after the conclusion.</p> <p>After the introduction, there should be a conceptual framework defining the variables of the study, and an empirical review showing what other authors have done in relation to this study. Then the materials and methods section can follow.</p> <p>In the fifth sentence, the word “programmemes” should be spelt appropriately.</p> <p>Paper touch on the in-thing in our world today – Green Economy</p> <p>Under Table 3a, in the last sentence, the authors should be referenced as “Lencucha et al, 2020) and it should come at the end of the entire sentence not between.</p>	<p>s</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Chukwu Vera Amuche</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Nigeria</p>