

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_130442
Title of the Manuscript:	COSTS AND RETURNS ANALYSIS OF CASSAVA PRODUCTION IN IJEBU-NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OGUN-STATE, NIGERIA.
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>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	From a scientific perspective, this contribution is very weak. It resembles more of a summary of a small market study than a scientific contribution.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is acceptable.	
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.	The abstract reflects the content of the contribution.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The authors have provided an overly vague contextualization of what is intended to be a precise analysis. For example: i) They discuss the importance of agriculture and cassava without objectively presenting the significance of cassava production in the agricultural economy. ii) They cite improbable statistics (e.g., "with an average yield of 69,374 kg/ha [5]"), mention derived products without addressing the objectives of the producers. Previous studies have shown that some producers prioritize meeting organoleptic needs over technical requirements such as yield or production cycle (see, for example, Mondo et al., 2019). The authors refer to yield improvements following the adoption of quality seeds but fail to provide supporting data to substantiate their claims. The authors possess quantitative data that could enable an objective understanding of the constraints related to production or profitability (e.g., through regression analysis), yet they choose to present a superficial report based solely on respondents' perceptions. Family labor plays a significant role in agricultural production in developing countries, but the authors remain silent on how they estimated labour inputs. Additionally, they do not calculate the profit margin, which is a key indicator for formulating policy recommendations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent but not sufficiently well utilized.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

#### 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:	Jean Charles Ononino
Department, University & Country	University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon