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	**1. In the introduction subheading:** -objectives of the study should be incorporated. -synchronize by mentioning the analytical tool (s) used for each stated objective(s). **2.-Literature Review:** this section is not necessary in a journal of this status . I suggest it should be summarized and included in the INTRODUCTION subsection **3. Methodology subsection:** -need to indicate the Sampling frame. -indicate reason why you sampled 60 farmers **4.Conclusion subsection:** Lines 451to 455 should be deleted because it is not a 'conclusion' Conclusion should reflect major findings from which the recommendation should emanate directly.-Mention the 'institution charged' with extension and research in line461 -Your last recommendation (lines 464-466) is actually in place in Nigeria. I suggest farmers enlightenment of the benefit of insurance cover should surfice.	
Minor REVISION comments	-Line 163 to 165 : Are reference to show that the selected LGAs are known for their all round rice production -suggest that Results and discussion section should include Subheading which could be in line with the 'Tables' for a smooth flow. - avoid using 'table' instead of Table (number) in body of manuscript.	

Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer