ISSN: 2320-5407

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55440**

Title: ANALYSE DE LA RENTABILITE ECONOMIQUE DE LÃ¢Â€Â™EXPLOITATION DE TROIS LEGUMINEUSES FOURRAGERES DANS LA ZONE PERI-URBAINE DU DISTRICT DE BAMAKO

Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

✓ Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity		✓		
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The manuscript offers a useful, practice-oriented profitability assessment of forage-legume production in peri-urban Bamako and provides clear farm-account indicators that can inform extension and producer decision-making. However, the evidence base is limited by a very small effective sample, insufficient detail on data validation, and a lack of sensitivity/robustness analysis under price and yield variability. With stronger methodological transparency and expanded sampling (or explicit limitation of claims), the paper could be publishable.

Recommendation: Accept after major revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

1. The manuscript has a clear and applied objective: estimating production costs and economic profitability of three forage legumes in peri-urban Bamako using operating accounts.
2. The methods use standard farm-management indicators (operating result, unit cost per kg, profitability rate), which are appropriate for an economic profitability assessment.
3. The study provides concrete, decision-relevant outputs (cost/kg and profitability rates) that can directly inform farmers, extension agents, and local planners.

ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. The comparison across species and production axes is practically useful and highlights heterogeneity in performance rather than presenting a single averaged result.
5. The discussion plausibly links profitability differences to agronomic and market factors (labor, inputs, yield, market demand), which supports interpretation and policy relevance.

Weaknesses

1. The effective analytical sample is extremely small for species-level conclusions (operating accounts appear to rely on a very limited number of producers per species/axis), which limits generalizability.
2. Selection and measurement risk: cost and revenue estimates depend heavily on accurate tracking of labor, inputs, and prices; the paper does not sufficiently detail how these were validated or standardized across sites.
3. Comparability issues exist across axes (different input bundles, subsidies, labor costs, and marketing conditions), yet results are sometimes interpreted as if species effects dominate.
4. Statistical uncertainty is not addressed: there are no sensitivity analyses (price shocks, yield variability), confidence intervals, or robustness checks—important given volatile input/output markets.
5. Presentation and clarity issues reduce rigor: inconsistent units/packaging (bottes of different kg), and limited transparency on how yields were measured and converted can lead to misinterpretation of the cost/kg comparisons.