



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_16637
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Various Policy Regimes toward Agricultural Export Growth in 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 (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	This paper addresses an issue of Assessment of various policy regimes toward agricultural exports of Nigeria. The paper is well written and highly readable. The literature review is fair and adequate. The organization of the paper is also good. However, the contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge is not very significant, though the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. One of the main limitations of the paper is that other than looking at the trend in agricultural exports, the author has not included any other factors in the econometric model. Some of the possible candidate variables are the share of government spending on agriculture and the share of agriculture in GDP. The manuscript does require some revisions.	The reviewer is very correct by stating that the paper is well written, highly readable, fair and adequate. He is also correct by saying that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound; and that the organization of the paper is good. However, I totally disagree that the contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge is not very significant. The article is about Nigeria, the most populous country in entire Africa. Given good governance, Nigeria can be an instrument for positive influence in the world. However, leadership is her problem. Modeling the performance of the policy regimes that have ruled her is very significant. This is because information is vital to choose the best. The paper is about performance of policy regimes and not about trend analysis of agricultural export in Nigeria. This will be



SDI Review Form 1.6

		subject of next research. The reviewer even acknowledged in the opening statement that the paper addressed an issue of performance evaluation of various policy regimes toward agricultural exports of Nigeria. I noticed that the reviewer confused the model that I used with econometric model.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(a) Some of the references listed under references are not cited in the body of the paper: Imoudu, P. D. (2005); Lafiagi, M. S. (1984); and Tanko, L., Onyenweaku, C. E. and Nwosu (2006). (b) In Line 110, there is a repetition. (c) In Lines 118, “good knowledge” should be changed to “better understanding”. (d) In line 137, the population size is mistakenly written as 149,229,090,140 million. Even without the term million, this represents a population more than 20 times larger than the world population. (e) Sections 2.4 and 2.5 should be merged. (f) In Line 261, “11.1 percentages” should be changed to “11.1 percent” and “45.9” should be changed to “45.9 percent”. (g) In Line 322, the term “regimed” should be changed to “regimes”. (h) Since there are two papers by Diao <i>et al.</i> (2010) and the authors are different in two studies other than the first author, some changes should be done.	(a) Lafiagi, M. S. (1984) is in the body of the work (see line 136); but I have deleted Imoudu, P. D. (2005); and Tanko, L., Onyenweaku, C. E. and Nwosu (2006). (b) There is no repetition (c) Changed to ‘better understanding’. (d) Corrected (e) Merged (f) Corrected (g) Corrected (h) One deleted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Given the limited number of observations per each regime, the results presented in Tables 1 and 2 may not be very robust. This limitation would have overcome by using quarterly data. The author could consider including a table or a graph showing the performance of agricultural exports in Nigeria during the study period.	The scholar could not do anything about it because the periods have been so defined by previous scholarly publications. Refer to Abolagba <i>et al.</i>, 2010. Again, the article is about assessment of policy regimes and not trend analysis of agricultural export in Nigeria. This will be subject of next research.