SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_10726**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Impact of the Fadama II Intervention on Rural Households in Kogi and Kwara States, 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	• **The introduction was very silent on the problem that the study addressed. It just focused on the description of the Fadama II project. Authors should highlight the need for an impact evaluation of such a project in the introduction.**	Noted and addressed
	• **Sampling method for selection of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries from each Local government Area (LGA) was not stated or explained. Authors should indicate the actual sampling method adopted to select respondents (e.g. simple random sampling through balloting, systematic random sampling, etc.)**	Corrected
	• **In several instances, authors have presented figures for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries for the two states in a fashion that makes it difficult for the reader to understand some sentences. E.g. on lines 251, 252 and 253, authors report of N111, 275 (N119, 275) … N211, 005 (240, 000)…. This type of presentation is very confusing. The logic in the sentence would be better expressed if authors compare beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries in Kogi State separately from that of Kwara state.**	Corrected
	• **The differences between the figures in Table 3 for 'with and without' comparison should have been tested using student's t- to check**	Addressed

	the statistical significance. If authors could do that, it will lend more credence to their discussion of the figures in the Table regarding project impact. Same should be done for Table4	
	• **The units used to measure variables in Tables 3 and 4 should be clearly stated. For example, was crop income measured for a season?, a year? And was it measured in Naira, $ or what unit? Again, in Table 4, unit of measurement for productivity or yield is not stated. Is it in Kg, Metric tons, etc. and what is the unit of measurement for land, was it per acre or per hectare?**	Effected
	• **In Table 5 too, consumption measurement is not quite clear; was it per week, per month, or per annum?**	Corrected
	• **In Tables 5 and 6, some of the T-statistics are not significant even at 10%. However, authors are emphasising on positive impact for such variables, which is quite strange. Authors should be careful in their attribution of positive impact to the project especially when the t-statistic is not significant. It simply means that the difference occurred by chance!**	Noted
	• **Generally, the discussion section focused on describing the same figures in the Tables. Authors should do critical discussions of the implications of the results and how their findings relate to findings of other related works. So far, the results of the study have not been compared with existing literature and authors have to strengthen this aspect of the paper.**	Noted

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	• Since non-beneficiary respondents were selected from the same project communities, authors should briefly explain how they dealt with spillover effects from beneficiaries to non-beneficiaries • Several words have joined together in the whole work (e.g. on page4, line89, you have Kogistate instead of Kogi State; on line 90, you have inKwara instead of in Kwara.., etc). Authors should take their time to read the work again and correct all such typographical errors • The title of Table1 on page 10 should read: Major sources of income for farmers in Kogi State. • Table 2 should also read like the one above with Kwara state in the place of Kogi • In the referencing, years of publication of papers should come just after the names of authors.	Addressed Corrected All respondents are not farmers Ditto Journal format
Optional/General comments	I think the paper looks interesting but authors have to address the issues highlighted to make it look very good.	