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	**Short Research 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	**There is no major revision required in the text of the paper.** **However, following revision in the references is required.** **1. Afolabi 2002, Asumugha *et al* 2008, Ikpi 1990 and John and Olaniyan 2003 are not referred in the text. Please make sure there are referred in the appropriate places in the text. If some of all of these are not referred in the text, delete there from the list of reference.**	
Minor REVISION comments	**1. In the Result and Discussion section, socio economic characteristics of respondent, 4th paragraph – you talked about the household (HH) size. You mentioned in the last sentence that most of the beef marketers have large HH size. What is the standard for HH size categorization – large, average, small? It is seen from the data that 53.3% HH have family size 1-5 which is small or average to me. Please check it once and make necessary correction. Since I do not know Nigerian standard size of HH, I may be wrong in defining the HH size. However, I suggest making the standards and interpreting on the basis of that.** **2. It may be nice if you expand the Table 3 by adding**	

	two columns - confidence interval (lower and upper limits) of the means at 95% interval as the mean values (point estimates) calculated based on the sample may not be100 % precise. So it may be preferable to present the point values along with confidence interval. **3. Some specific observations for revision.** **3.1 Introduction section, 1st para, last sentence (According to the NLDP, ……) need edit – perhaps breakdown into different sentence would be needed to make more understandable.** **3.2 A couple of reference and data in the text may be good such as** - **introduction, 2nd paragraph, - it is alleged that …… , high marketing cost and margins (Reference…….).** - **introduction, 4th paragraph, - A lot of families …. Marketing for sustenance (do any data available to proof a lot of? – or reference).** - **Introduction, 4th paragraph, - Beef cattle trade provides largest livestock market in the country (does any reference available???).** - **Introduction, 4th paragraph, - Government agencies ……realize a lot of revenue ….. market charges and direct taxation (do any data available on this? Or any reference available on this information?).** - **Result and Discussion section - in page 7, under Socioeconomic characteristics of respondents, 5th paragraph, - you said According World Bank Report ……. Please make sure which specific report and refer it in a standard way.**	

Optional/General comments	**1. The writing seems to be bit wordy – can be made more robust particularly in introduction.** **2. The paper would be more informative and also useful for policy makers if you analyse, interpret and conclude the information from other perspectives as well (beyond wholesaler and retailer) such as** - **gender perspective – as male and female might have different preferences.** - **Age perspectives –** - **Number of experience perspectives** - **Level education perspectives -**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer