



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2030
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS AFFECTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY AMONG FARMERS IN IMO STATE

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	Abstract: The recommendation is not well formulated. Introduction: The problem as stated in the introduction is not well defined. The work is not also grounded in any analytical framework. Line 41-“high input techniques” should be “high input technologies”. Line 43-“affordability” should be changed to “high cost”. The last section of the introduction should be reformulated. i.e. line 51-54 to indicate the main objective and specific objectives. Materials and Method: Authors should provide information about the geographical coordinates of Imo state, land area and total population. Dominant soil types, vegetation, agro-ecological zone and rainfall amount and distribution in Imo state should also be provided. In Line 62 the phrase “selecting the sample” should read “selecting the sample communities”. While the authors stated that the total number of respondents was 99, addition of the number of respondents in the communities adds up to 120 (49+44+27). The authors failed to mention the types of crops on which data were collected. Authors should provide data on input and output cost and returns and perform benefit cost analysis. At least	Agreed with reviewer “Corrected” Agreed with reviewer “Corrected” “Corrected” “Corrected” “Corrected” “Provided” “Provided” Benefit-cost, and cost and return analysis



SDI Review Form 1.6

	cost and returns for 1 ha of arable crop production should be provided. Results and Discussion: Tables: Two tables are not enough for a full paper. Table I is not properly organised. Some sub-headings of the table are bolded and sometimes while others are not. Some of the sub-headings are not complete. For instance the sub-heading "Number of years" should probably read "Number of years in spent in school". Some of the sub-headings do not also have units (e.g. years, ha etc). Okada must be put in inverted comma and explained. Sentence Construction. Some of the sentences are not well constructed. Line 173-The sentence "That is, it might result in technical inefficiency" is not good English. It must be revised. Line 175- "show" should be "shows". Revise the sentences in the following Lines: 176, 191. On line 199- "The table also showed" should read "The table also shows". The results are not were discussed. This section needs to be strengthened with relevant literature. Conclusion and Recommendations: Very poor and not based on facts. These sections need to be re-written. References: Authors should follow the format of the Journal. Most of the references listed are not found in the text. For instance, IITA, 1990; Odurukwe and Ikeorgu, 1991; FAO, 1990 and many others.	cannot be carried out because there are no data in the returns. "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Corrected" "Adhered to" "Re-written" "Corrected"
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		