



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_6560
Title of the Manuscript:	Food Security Determinants among Urban Food Crop Farming Households in Cross River State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	Abstract: The abstract is only a one paragraph page and should not be in sub-sections as it is. Introduction: The sources of the claim in lines 19 to 22 should be indicated. More importantly, the opening paragraph should address the issue of urban household food supply shortages that have led to urban food crop farming households. Lines 49 to 69 should be moved to start the introduction, starting from Agriculture..... Numbering of authors, opinions: The numbering of opinions of scholars should be superscript and should appear at the end of the opinion. Moreover, author names cannot be substituted with numbers. Literature Review: The review needs to have a conceptual framework. There is the need to have more review on urban household crop farming and food security. What has been done is merely reference to the work of others in this area as support for this study. Data for the study: There is the need to present the data you want to analyse. The sequence is data presentation, data analysis, and interpretation of results. Results and Discussion: There is the need to state the test criteria before evaluation of the results. Conclusion: Line 347 is wrong 47.5% is not greater than 52.5%. More importantly, the findings of the study have not been indicated anywhere. Recommendations: The recommendations do not derive from the findings because there are no findings. The first one is out of point because nothing suggests that family size is the cause of food insecurity. In any case, it	This is done according to the standard and guidelines of the journals. The is nothing we can do about this The source of claim in lines 19 to 22 has been done. But the opening paragraph still remains because this research area (urban food crop farming and food)is a virgin area in Nigeria. Literatures are rarely available In numbering, we used the format requested by the journal. It seems this reviewer is not acquainted with the guidelines and format of the journal. He/she should read the journal guidelines. The conceptual framework and additional literature review requested has been added. We followed the guideline of AJAEES in presenting our data. So this has been taken care of by the journal guidelines. We disagree with the statement “there are no findings in this study” this is not true. However, the conclusion and recommendation has been revisited and major corrections done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	could also be in favour of food production for the family if it is properly utilized. The second recommendation could not have been so because urban crop farming by households as posited by this study is more of a coping strategy. i.e. a means to support the main means of livelihood of the family.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Corrections: Line 162 “carry should be carried”, line 220 “profile” should be substituted with appropriate word, line 239 “present should be presents and describe should be described”, line 240 “efficacy should be replaced with efficiency”	These corrections have been effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		