



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7366
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE GENDER DIMENSIONS IN FOOD UNSECURED FARM HOUSEHOLDS IN ORSU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF IMO 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please ensure this manuscript is read by a proof reader. There are several awkward sentences which need to be cleaned up. For instance, line 52 'hour' should be 'hours'; line 53 there should be a 'on' between 'data' and 'food insecurity'; line 58 'computing' should be 'compute'; line 64 'full fledge' should be 'full-fledged'; line 74 un-capitalize 'cashew', line 76 un-capitalize other crops. I won't continue to mark grammatical errors, as this is an essential task to complete prior to revision, but these must be addressed by the paper could be considered further. There are simply too many errors to identify.	These have all been corrected in the text.
	Lines 150-155: What was the rationale for calculating food insecurity differently for men and women? This needs to be addressed thoroughly so the readers understand why different variables were used.	Literature evidences and reasons were cited to justify this in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It appears in conversion to .pdf that some words were combined. Please check that the original version does not have these errors. For instance, line 41 "examinestatus" and "orquality", line 74 "producingtree" are shown as one word each.	They have all been resolved.
	Lines 40-44: split sentence into 2 or revise for clarity.	Done.
	Lines 213-215: I understand this point, but it might be good to support it with a reference (at least to frame the issue culturally), as this would not necessarily be the case in all cultures.	Done
	Lines 227-229: If the data model suggests that female-headed households can subsist adequately on a smaller	Addressed as observed during survey.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	amount of money, do you have any other qualitative data from the surveys to support this? Especially given the issue raised that women tended to have more mouths to feed, how is this number so much smaller? Suggesting that women can subsist on less income without a good qualification might be misconstrued in the wrong way. Please address in the revisions.	
	I would like to see in the discussion section a broader engagement with how this research can be applicable to other contexts and where future research should be directed. The authors did a good job of presenting the specific issues in this case study area, but didn't thoroughly indicate regional or national significance.	See lines 316-325 added
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have no qualms with the methods used in this paper. The statistical model appears appropriate to addressing the research question, and provides important insight into differences in food security status.	Thank you so much.
	Overall I believe the paper is methodologically sound and I find the results interesting and useful, I would just like to see further explanation for how the different variables were chosen for calculating food insecurity in men and women. This is the first I have seen of this technique. As well, while the sentence structure and logic are easy to follow overall, it certainly needs to be checked for minor grammatical errors (as these errors can distract from the contributions of the paper).	