



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5620
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN RICE PRODUCTION IN ABIA STATE, NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper examines the role of risk in rice production in Nigeria. This is an interesting topic. The problem is that the analysis of risk is not well developed in the paper. First, the paper relies on a survey data on 60 rice producers. 60 farmers is a rather small number... Second, the paper reports farmers' subjective evaluations of the relative importance of risk according to 5 categories: 1/ political risk, 2/ technical risk, 3/ market risk, 4/ financial risk, 5/ social risk. These rankings have at least two significant drawbacks: the risk categories seem a little "too broad" to be useful for policy prescriptions; and relative rankings do not provide an "absolute assessment" of each type of risk and its implications for food security management and policy. This reduces the contributions made by the manuscript. Third, the analysis presented in the paper is mostly descriptive. Just reporting summary statistics from the farm survey does not provide an in-depth investigation of farm management or policy issues. In particular, the paper does not develop a refined analysis of risk exposure or of risk management strategies used by rice farmers. On this point, the paper falls short of current literature on the evaluation of risk management in agriculture. And	This is ambiguous statement as the analysis of risk is well developed in the paper. The sample size of 60 is large enough for the study. According to literature, sample size of 20-300 is considered statically adequate especially when the attributes give excellent reflection of the population as well as the required degree of freedom. Also the rice farmers well experienced. Refer to descriptive statistics in page 9 where various components of the broad risk sources were highlighted by the respondents. This gives the background for this broad risk sources. The ranking of risk sources may have drawbacks and this is the reason for the validation of concordance with econometric tools like w-statistics and Pearson criterion. I totally disagree with the reviewer since econometric tool like Pearson criterion and w-statistics were used. The reviewer may go through the work again.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the linkages between data analysis and policy prescriptions seem very weak. Fourth, the paper could be better written. For example, the equations presented on p. 7 have typos and are difficult to read. And it is not clear what the concordance measures discussed on p. 7-11 tell us about the importance of risk for rice farmers...	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		