



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_10481
Title of the Manuscript:	Tanzania Economic Performance from Pre-Independence Period to Current Policy Reforms: Did we Purse the Right Way?
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The research questions and objectives of the study have not been articulated. The paper seemed to a review. However, the format of regular article was adopted and that improperly. The author(s) should either adopt the regular article religiously or use the review approach. In the regular article approach, the should be a clear problem definition with accompanying objectives. This will guide the rest of the sections. The relevance of the paper as well as how the rest of he paper is organised should be provided for. The methods of analysis emanating from the objectives would inform the nature of information to be used. The results and discussion would then be sectioned based on the objectives outlined in the introduction. The title suggest that there is a 'right way' of economic performance. That right way would have to emanate from the method or other country literature. In the light of these, whether Tanzania's economic performance is the 'right way' or not could not be rigorously established. There are significant typo errors that demand necessary attention. The spelling of Abstract as 'Abstrcut' to 'competind interests' This is unacceptable.	Yes, the objectives and research question were massing but have been include as highlighted on pages 2 and b3. Furthermore, problem of the study has been also highlighted on page 2 just before the research objectives To this end, having included the research objectives, the results are articulated to the stated objectives and research questions. As to whether the study has shown the way Tanzania pursued the right way or otherwise; it has been discussed clearly under subsections 3.1 and 3.2 that address the success stories and challenges of the 1990s reforms. Issues that set premises for the discussion of right way of economic performance are discussed under subsection 2.1 that addresses material. Again, success stories and challenges of Post 1990s policy reforms are discussed under subsections 3.1 and 3.2 respectively. If one goes through the results under all subsections, it is clearly evident that Tanzania did not pursue the right way since the majority of Tanzanians dot not enjoy the social welfare emanating from the policy reforms. Attention has been paid to the typo errors as highlighted on pages 1 and 14.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		