



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_8558
Title of the Manuscript:	INDUSTRIAL DEMAND ANALYSIS FOR MILLET IN KADUNA AND KANO STATES OF NIGERIA
Type of the 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	Generally the content and of the article is satisfactory. However, the author fails to include key variable such as population, previous year demand and trend variable to capture taste and preference in the demand equation. Secondly, the author fails to discuss the results. The results component of the paper requires major revision. The constant term of the demand equation need not to be mentioned especially with regard to its significance. The conclusion and recommendation is not consistent with the result of the study	Colour and Variation of Millet was Used as Variable or Proxy to Taste/Preferences and We avoid too Much of Dummy to Avoid Error in Anlysis like Multicollinearity. The Paper had been Revised and Properly discussed Key Areas. Constant Term Not Discussed as Raised, Conclusion and Recommendation are all in line with Title of Articles and Findings of this Article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should assign reason for the purposive sample of the study sites. How was the data obtained? How many data points? Was there any missing data point? If so how was it corrected for? Kindly improve on the grammar The author need to specify the a priori expectations of the explanatory variables	Purposive Sampling Method Used justified in The Study as Observed. Type of Data and Number of Data, Number of Firms Used Reflected in Methodology. Grammatical Errors Corrected. Apriori Expectations of Explanatory Variables Reflected in the Article.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Satisfactory
---	--	---------------------