



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_11283
Title of the Manuscript:	Critique of baseline conditions of the Third National Fadama Development Project in Kogi State : Beneficiaries' perspective
Type of the Article	Minireview 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Lines 33 – 35 – Factual and as such should be backed by published source (i.e. cite the authority for the statement). Lines 57- 59 need to be re-written being the gap to be filled by the study. (Considering the laudable objectives, coverage and expanded components of the activities of the project, expectations were high. Therefore, concerns on the gap between expectations and reality become crucial.) Lines 59 -60 should be better written and followed by specific steps on how the critique will be carried out. Lines 78 -82 – These are socioeconomic characteristics. Provide the procedure for measuring other variables. Line 233 – laudable not loadable. Line 234 – which report is the author referring to? Lines 245 – 260 – Is the author talking about FGD finding? If yes, it should be stated as such. Line 257 – gendered is not appropriate. Probably engendered or led to. Line 285 – survey or FGD? Lines 365 -366 – the assertion was an exaggeration of the finding of the study. 368b -370 were more appropriate. Lines 367 -368 should be re-written. Lines 370b – 372 were not backed by finding. Line 372- 'is' should read 'was'	Well taken and affected The section was restructured. It was Taken care of in the methodology. Done Done It is focus group discussion. Well taken. Corrections made accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 14 – Article 'The' leading to line 15 is not	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	needed. Line 15 – farmers should read beneficiary. Line 37 – 1, 11 and 111 should be written as I, II and III. Provide the source of information for lines 40 – 52. Lines 140 – 142 – participating is not the same as benefitting. That they did not benefit does not mean they did not participate. Line 88 – referencing style is inconsistent with the style used elsewhere in the write-up. There is need for consistency. Line 162 – compare with referencing on line 88 for consistency. Lines 180 – 182 did not emanate from the preceding result and discussion. Re-check. Lines 188 – 201 gave a wrong impression of the information source. The information being sourced through the radio is not restricted to Fadama alone. Line 399 – ‘Oladeji’ not ‘Olajide’	These have been affected accordingly. It has been rewritten for clarity. Corrections made as suggested. Affected It was rewritten for clarity
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 9 – Fadama Users Group (FUG) is more appropriate instead of Fadama resource users. Line 89 – The finding is not surprising due to the purposive nature of group sampling. The reason cited by the author for low women participation could affect group functionality and as a result, prevent women’s groups from being purposively selected.	Affected Only functional groups were selected, but the groups have both men and women.