



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6584
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF MARKETING COST ON MARKETING MARGIN REALIZABLE FROM BEEF SALES IN BENIN CITY, 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In general, this a valuable work that tries to characterize the market of beef in Benin, Nigeria. The authors argue that since the knowledge of the people working in this activity and their needs and constrains they feel, could be possible to enhance their condition. The methodology to capture of information, by means of a questionnaire appears to be robust; however, there is not information whether or not the beef marketer is responsible or not for the economical maintenance of the family, or if the educational grade is completed or not, among other observations. In the discussion, the authors say that the amount of beef marketers with high education level is because education improves the ability to make accurate agricultural decision and to innovate. However, they do not see the possibility that the case-effect relationship could be the opposite: the access of money allows the access to education; then, a kind of virtuous circle occurs. Besides, when the authors discuss the characteristics of the beef marketers, do not compare against the rest of the population to give an idea about the similarity with them (marital status, level of education, etc.) . So, the characterization lack importance if does not take the characteristic of the global population into account. Finally, I think there is minor problem with the presentation and discussion of the results of the models. There is a bit of redundancy that can be avoided. For instance: they present the coefficients of the model, and after that they discuss the result explaining what that result meaning giving the result again. That happens several times in the article. Finally; there is a point not discussed in my opinion. From the questionnaire and the results of the models	Points noted and addressed in the corrected version. Point addressed in the corrected version.
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	seems that the beef market is not as good as one want, because of the constrains; however they keep in the activity.¿ Why? The authors do not point on this issue.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I would avoid the word “servant”, and will change by “worker” or something similar. I am not sure about the recommended number of decimals, but I suggest reducing to two (see Table 3).	Correction noted and effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Increase the number of references to give more force to the discussion. I did not see anything about the application of an informed consent to the beef marketers; however, because it is an observational study, the authors only have to be aware with the discrete use of the information.	Correction noted and Effected.