



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_12272
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF HOUSEHOLD ENDOWMENT ON FERTILIZER USE IN RICE PRODUCTION IN KWANDE, BENUE STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Line 51: Any source/reference to support this? As it stands now it sounds quite journalistic and a very familiar rhetoric in most African countries. - Line 153: Mention some of these studies	Some references have been included to support this. Some studies have been cited.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Line 57: Is it possible to get current statistics? It will be interesting to know the current picture fifteen years down the line. - Line 59/60: Any source/reference to support this? - Line 110: Were small and big considered as one each? Won't the value differ? How was this accounted for?	It is not easy to get fifteen years time series data on state level basis for this comparison. However, current reports that highlight Benue State's position with respect to rice production in Nigeria have been cited. References have been included for support. Yes, both small and big were considered as one. We acknowledge that the value for each is different. However, as a robustness check, we estimated a model without the livestock ownership variable but found no effect of this on the original result. Hence, we maintained the original result.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		