



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	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 (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	Abstract: The abstract is too long. Expunge lines 5-13 since your study is an empirical study but not an opinion paper. Start the abstract with the main purpose of the study written in past tense. Method of data collection used should be stated such as questionnaire. Introduction: The introduction is quite okay but the following abbreviations should be written in full first. These include; USAID and WARD. Expunge line 80-82. Editorial work is necessary in the introduction. Literature review: delete the entire literature review (84-160) since the study is an empirical study. Methodology: The study area should be well specified such as geographical location of the place. The sampling technique should be purposive sampling technique in selection of both the local governments and communities, but not random sampling technique. Other editorial works abound. Results and discussion: The tables and	NOTED/CORRECTED CORRECTED Some aspects of the literature are relevant for proper understanding of risk and the sources, however, irrelevant aspects are expunged. NOTED/CORRECTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	discussion of this section are quite encouraging but it needs a lot of editorial works. Delete or move lines 342-352 to methodology, then recast the next sentence. 6. Conclusion: Recast the sentence in line 455-457. 7. References: Uniform referencing style such as APA style should be adhered to.	CORRECTED
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Editorial work is needed	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is of good quality research work and I recommend it for publication in your Journal after the above corrections are strictly made by the author.	