



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7145
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS DETERMINING URBAN POVERTY OF FARMING HOUSEHOLDS IN A TROPICAL REGION
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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 <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	1. There is need for authors to include some discussion on the increasing role of urban agriculture in poverty reduction. The work is silent in this regard... 2. Authors should made additional efforts in this work to convince the scientific community that 'SEX' is a determinant factor in poverty levels. At the moment, this is vaguely presented. For instance, how does this finding (sex-poverty interaction) relate with authors' observations within the area of study? Does the finding tally with what is observed? 3. Tobit model are quite very useful, if handled with extreme care. The care requires a researcher to graph the relationship between each explanatory variable and the outcome variable. This then helps in looking for evidence that the errors are not identically and normally distributed. The results of this study did not include such graphs. It would be necessary to include such graphs as a way of presenting checks/validation of results from the analysis.	• This has been included. • Literature has revealed that SEX is a determinant factor. Please see revised manuscript. • The VIF has taken care of this.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	a) Break Introduction into paragraphs.	• The corrections have been effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	b) Line 55: “Sixty percent of urban growth are due to natural growth” should read “Sixty percent of urban population growth are due to natural growth” c) Line 56:‘areal’ expansion instead of ‘area expansion’. d) Line 61-62: not pull factors.... Should be push factors... Please review statement. e) Study area map should be included. f) Your abstract indicate UYO is the study area so why not provide specific information on UYO, the study area? g) Correct the lat-long ‘minutes’ on line 79 under the Study Area section. h) Conclusion is silent about the critical role of asset (land) ownership in urban areas towards poverty reduction.	• Correction effected. • Correction effected. • Correction effected. • Map of Akwa Ibom State(study area) included). • Correction effected. • Included.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors should also consider sustainability in his analysis and discussion of the study. Conclusion is generally weak. Authors have not clearly shown their contribution to the scientific community, which should be a major basis for conducting this (and indeed any other) research.	• Conclusion has been revised.