



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_13231
Title of the Manuscript:	FOREIGN LAND DEALS IN AFRICA: IMPLICATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL TRADE
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	With the go-ahead received from the Editor regarding formal aspects of publication process (presence online of a old version of the manuscript), hereby I send my comments and remarks in support of this publication. With regards to the selection and application of the econometric model, I cannot give my support to the authors because it falls outside of my competences. • Page 2, lines 29-32: "At a time when the food aid convention production in Africa." This paradox deserves more emphasis in the paper, along with the reported data on food import. I recommend the authors express the concept also in the title or in the abstract. • Table 3. The titles of the columns, when appropriate, should report the units (e.g. \$ for net food export, as reported in page 10 line 3) • Authors should clarify the difference, if any, between the index "agricultural land as percentage of land area" (reported in the abstract, line 6, and at page 17, line 8), and the index discussed at page 9, i.e. "agricultural value as percentage of gross domestic product (GDP)" • Page 9, line 10: "Table 3 is that all the countries" should be "Table 3 is that almost all the countries" • Page 10, line 2: "2008" should be "2010" • Page 10, line 3: "1998" should be "2008" • Page 10, line 4: "2008" should be "2010" • Page 10, lines 4-5: the sentence "Given the reduced arable the two variables." should be deleted because not strongly proven at this stage. This revision does not affect the importance of the figures reported by the paper.	It's been noted and adjusted The index emphasised in the abstract was used in our econometric analysis while the ones discussed in page 9 were used to describe the stylized facts for the study. Corrections have been made

	• Page 10, line 6: "2008" should be "2010" • How the authors explain the two interesting inversions (RQ being almost stable in time) shown by Table 3: Malawi net food export (from -47.23 to +147.34) and Sudan net food export (from +135.26 to -745.62) • Page 11, line 5: here the authors present parameters for institutional quality (rule of law, control of corruption, regulatory quality, government effectiveness) different from the ones mentioned in the abstract and page 9 (RQ and PHR): to avoid confusion, the authors should clarify and better highlight the use of different parameters at this stage. • Page 11, line 15: table 4 does not reflect what the authors can only argue as "expected". Therefore "interests. As reflected in table 4, the lower" should be "interests. <u>It is expected</u> that the lower" • Page 13, line 33: "consequences include" should be "consequences may include" • Page 14, line 1: what the authors mean by "organic mutations" ? please clarify properly • Page 15, line 13: "this signifies the intense extent of" should be "this signifies the chance for intense extent of" • Page 15, line 14: "this study has been able to prove that" should be "this study sustains that" • Page 15, line 18: "ongoing analysis" should be "ongoing reflections" because so far the paper reports a series of information but the analytical approach starts now • Page 15, line 23: media report? Please clarify (eventually also in the relevant table)	Corrections effected Corrections effected Corrections effected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Page 2, line 15: “who will used them to produce” should be “who will use them to produce” • Page 2, line 22: “inadequate of knowledge” should be “inadequate knowledge” • Page 2, line 29: “food in security” should be “food insecurity” • Page 3: the first paragraph is a bit difficult to read due to long sentences. Please make reading more easy, first of all the sentence “According to [7]....to a complex problem.” • Page 3, second-last line: “sorghum. Others..” the sentence should be revised. • Page 9, line 6: “ regulations. Participation and human rights (PHR), the RQ and PHR was used as” should be “regulations, and participation and human rights (PHR) were used as” • Page 10, line 2: “Comparing the two periods, the” should be “Comparing the 16 countries in the two periods, the” • Page 10, lines 6-7: the sentence “..and some of the countries like DRC....respectively” should be deleted because the discussion is here based on the average values. • Page 11, line 9: “Table 4 presents, among others, the measures” should be “Tables 4 and 5 present the measures” • Page 13, line 3: “-0.77” should be “-0.74” and the successive sentence should follow without changing paragraph • Page 13, line 25: “table 5” should be “Table 6” • Page 13, line 25: “in all he period” should be “in all the period, <u>with the exception of Egypt 1996</u>” • Page 13, line 32: “Table 5” should be “Table 6” • Page 15, line 6: “table 5” should be “Table 7” • Page 15, line 10: “table 5” should be “Table 7” • Page 15, line 14: “quality matter” should be “quality matters” • Page 19, line 17: “government; the host” should be “government, the host”	All corrections suggested have been appropriately adjusted
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Page 15, line 18: "the study adopt an empirically investigation of the" should be "this study adopts an empirical approach of the" • Page 15, line 20-21: the sentence " The study selects 16 countries in Africa where...have been reported." should be deleted because a repetition of the previous one. • Page 15, line 21: "It analyzed the availability of land to agricultural production using the" should be "We analyzed the availability of land vs. agricultural production in the" • Page 16, last line: "model. Therefore, equation" should be "model, equation"	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• Add a reference (e.g. in the abstract and/or in the introduction) to the International year of family farming (2014) launched by the UN. • Key words: replacement of "land deals" (already present in the title) with, e.g., "food sovereignty"	