



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013 AJEA 4374
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF OIL SPILLAGE ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF CASSAVA IN NIGER DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 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 <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	Abstract lines 10-28 (i) It is not properly presented in addition to poor expression. See lines 12, 14, 19, 23-28 (ii) Communities studied were not mentioned and recommendation not specific given the findings Introduction: (i) Lines 31-48 were unnecessary digression. (ii) The introduction lacked coherence. (iii) At the end, the objective did not reflect the focus of the title. Literature Review – The omission of Literature review in his study is a serious flaw. Methodology: (i) Methodology not explicit. See lines 131, 149- 152. (ii) Variable X_2 (cassava cuttings) line 162 and variable X_5 (Dummy variable) not defined in their proper terms. (iii) No restrictions or a-priori expectation in line 174, e.g. $a_0 > 0$, $a_1 > f$ etc. These restrictions guide the researcher in stating and testing of hypotheses. (iv) The technique & software used in handling the regression analyses were not stated. Result & Discussion: Result were poorly presented, reported and discussed: (i) The use of "majority of", "could have", "could however", "might make", "probably because", "may", etc. , created uncertainty in findings or lack of	Corrected Corrected Restructured Restructured Objective of the determinants of land productivity is expunged. This is because; effect of oil spillage is already captured in the preceding objective. - Corrected Variable X_2 corrected, X_5 is okay Not very necessary here Technique treated, software not very necessary here Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	accuracy in the result. See lines 192, 194-195, 196,201,202,203,206,207,209,210,211,243,252,260,283,288,298,302,325,331,349; etc. (ii) Table 1, (line 231), 2(line 254) 5(lines 333/334) It would be better to add “communities” after “ spillage” so that one may understand that it is the frequency of the attributes that is the issue not “oil spillage frequency” and “non-oil spillage frequency”. Conclusion/Recommendations: (i) It cannot be concluded from the results and analysis that oil spillage was the main issue. (ii) The 5 variables in line 173 only contributed 45% of the systematic variable in land productivity with 55% unexplained, and farmers experience was more significant than oil spills impact. See the t-ratio in table 6. Therefore, the overall performance of the model is not significant, and as such cannot be used for the type of conclusion here in the study. (iii) Recommendations were general in nature. Reference: Lines 393 & 396(Federal Office of Statistics) & 420 (punctuation problem).	The regression result of oil spillage (which is significant) is just an aspect of the effect of oil spillage. It complements the results of the descriptive statistics which are also significant (see Tables 4 &5). We feel the conclusion is okay. Second recommendation adjusted. Corrected. Also, all references corrected in line with the Journal reference format.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Use of English: problem of punctuation, poor synthesis, coinage of expressions, etc. See some of them in lines 12-19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26-28, 33, 39, 44 &47, 52, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 68, 77, 78, 80, 81, 85, 89, 91,101,131, 149, 150, 152,171 180,182, 188 ,198, 238, 244 & 245 272, 296, 310, 312, 313, 314, 321, 528, 346, 358, 393, 396 & 420.	Checked
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NIL	