



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_17332
Title of the Manuscript:	Towards Enhancing Household's Food Security in Rural Abia State, Nigeria: Have Women Cooperative Societies got any place?
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	35-36, is Nabia state the bread basket of Nigeria? -48-50, too long and has lost meaning in the process -73,74 vary the way you start sentences -88-94, objectives are too many. I feel that there is only one objective which deals with factors affecting food security. -141, the sampling is not clear. Authors mention the use of multistage sampling but it's not clear how it was actually executed. The description of Abia is very long. Can the authors stick to the location, and agroecology only. 166, why did the authors use the Probit Model? -what necessitated the measurement of food security using HDDS? -307, Can the authors use the actual names and not x1, x2 so that readers can relate results. Where is the discussion about the results? 332-342, this is not a conclusion. It's a mere restatement of results 346, what informed the recommendation?	-141 Sampling procedures one LGA from Umuahia agricultural zone, in the LGA, selected 2 blocks, 3 circles and 30 women from each circle who are members of registered women cooperatives bringing the total to 180 respondents. Line 166. The dependent variable is a dummy variable
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-There is need for the authors to rework the paper especially on typos. -The authors need to use academic language and refrain from the use of words such as 'frown, gainsaying, mutation, intimate, folks, solace'	All the necessary correction has been effected .