



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	• Why are the hypotheses of the study not postulated? The relevance of research hypotheses cannot be ignored since this is an empirical study. • Where is the conceptual framework of this study? This can help in understanding the study and linking it to the theory. • The descriptive statistics are conspicuously missing in the manuscript. The author should provide a summary of the survey sample with the appropriate measures of dispersion and central tendency. • In table 1, provide Chi-Square tests to show whether food security indices for urban food crop farming households in the study area are significantly different. • In the logit model estimates, include the discussion of marginal effects in order to improve the quality of your discussions. • The author has discussed the results based on 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels. What was set as the apriori? The insignificant results based on the set apriori should not be discussed.	This has been postulated This corrections has been done. This correction has been done The result of the odd ratio is more robust than those of the marginal effect. That is why in some variables, the discussion of marginal effect is silent. The set apriori is 10%. The insignificant results are not discussed.
Minor REVISION comments	The research gap addressed by this manuscript may be improved based on the recent literature. What does the paper seek to contribute in advancement of literature?	This has been addressed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should provide the limitations of the logit model with regards to the assumptions made and the context of the study.	Not necessary for the topic.