



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56129

Title: ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC PROFITABILITY OF MORINGA FARMING IN THE URBAN COMMUNE OF AGADEZ

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: ANAPANA GOPAL

Reviewer's Comment For Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript examines the economic profitability of Moringa farming in the urban commune of Agadez, Niger. The topic is relevant given the increasing importance of Moringa production in food security, income generation, and climate resilience in Sahelian countries. The study is based on primary survey data collected from 115 producers and applies standard farm management and profitability analysis tools. While the study addresses an important issue and provides useful empirical data, the manuscript requires substantial revision in terms of clarity, methodological rigor, consistency of calculations, and language quality before it can be considered for publication.

Content and Originality

Strengths:

- The study focuses on a specific geographic area (Agadez), where limited empirical economic analyses of Moringa production appear to exist.
- The paper provides primary data on production costs, margins, and return rates.
- The inclusion of added value and rate of return enhances the economic perspective.

Concerns:

- The originality is moderate. Similar studies have been conducted in other regions of Niger (e.g., Niamey, Maradi, Djirataoua), and the manuscript does not clearly highlight what new contribution it makes beyond geographic replication.
- The research objectives are somewhat broad and not clearly formulated into specific research questions or hypotheses.
- The claim that the Moringa value chain contributes 1.1% of GDP is significant but not critically discussed in relation to the local findings.

Suggestion: Clearly articulate the knowledge gap this study fills and how it advances existing literature beyond previous regional profitability studies.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Technical Quality

Strengths:

- Use of simple random sampling and coverage of 25% of producers is methodologically reasonable.
- Economic indicators (gross margin, net margin, added value, rate of return) are appropriate for farm profitability analysis.
- Use of R and SPSS is mentioned.

Minor Concerns:

1. Formula Inconsistencies

- "MB = Noise Product – Operational Loads" appears to be a translation error.
- Added value (VA) formula inconsistently includes depreciation in one section but not in another.
- Economic profitability ratio is defined differently in different sections.

2. Numerical Inconsistencies

- The statement: "If a producer invests 5 FCFA, they should receive a profit of 4,635 FCFA" is mathematically incorrect and unrealistic.
- With a rate of return of 92.7%, an investment of 5 FCFA would yield approximately 4.635 FCFA profit, not 4,635 FCFA.
- Some totals differ slightly between sections (e.g., total cost values).

3. Capital Definition

- Invested capital is equated to annual expenses, which may not be conceptually accurate for economic profitability.
- Treatment of family labor needs clearer justification (opportunity cost?).

4. Statistical Analysis

- Although "comparison tests of means" are mentioned, no inferential statistical results are presented.
- Standard deviations are provided but not interpreted.

Recommendation: The manuscript requires technical revision and recalculation verification before publication.

Language and Presentation

The manuscript contains numerous grammatical, typographical, and translation errors. Examples:

- "Noise margin"
- "Noise reducer"
- "Visual link"
- "The account balances because..."
- Inconsistent spacing and punctuation.
- Repetition of statements in Results and Discussion.

The English requires professional editing. Several sections appear to be directly translated without proper proofreading.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Structure and Organization

Strengths:

- Standard academic structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion).
- Tables are included to summarize findings.

Weaknesses:

- Some tables are poorly formatted.
- The Results section mixes interpretation with description.
- Discussion largely repeats results rather than deep analytical comparison.
- Figure 1 is mentioned but not properly presented in the manuscript excerpt.
- Conclusion repeats numerical results without policy depth.

Suggestion:

- Separate clearly: Results (objective findings) and Discussion (interpretation and comparison).
- Improve logical flow between subsections.
- Strengthen policy implications.

References and Citations

Strengths:

- Includes regional literature and institutional reports.
- References local theses and government documents.

Weaknesses:

- Inconsistent formatting.
- Some references incomplete.
- DOI formatting inconsistent.
- Web links included without proper citation format.
- Limited international peer-reviewed journal references.
- No recent (post-2021) high-impact agricultural economics literature.

Recommendation: Standardize referencing according to journal guidelines (APA, Harvard, etc.) and strengthen the literature base with more peer-reviewed sources.

Overall Recommendation

The study addresses an important agricultural economics topic and provides valuable primary data from Agadez. However, due to significant issues in:

- Formula consistency
- Numerical accuracy
- Language quality
- Analytical depth
- Structural clarity

the manuscript requires minor revision before it can be considered suitable for publication.

Final Decision:

Minor to moderate Revision Required

The authors should carefully revise calculations, correct conceptual inconsistencies, improve language quality, strengthen methodological clarity, and enhance analytical discussion before resubmission.