



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10726
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of theFadama II Intervention on Rural Households inKogi 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	This is a mockery of impact analysis using PSM!! PSM is usually conducted with sample sizes that run into thousands; a very small sample of 240 in two groups to equal 480 is grossly inappropriate. In PMS usually large number observations that are laid off due to matching process. What is also worrisome is the nature of PMS reported PMS use to have a locus eg age, educational qualification , family size ,etc That is to say the people of the same age group having array of income or productive assets in treated and untreated groups. You cannot run income or productive assets as if it the sole locus for PSM. We use to say 'when estimating the propensity score, two choices have to be made. The first one concerns the model to be used for the estimation, and the second one the variables to be included in this model'. You can see Some Practical Guidance For The Implementation Of Propensity Score Matching <i>Journal of Economic Surveys</i> (2008) Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 31–72 Also see Dehejia/Wahba (1999): They use age, years of education, dummies for black, hispanic, nodegree, married and pre-treatment real income. Tables 1, 2,3, 4, 7,8 have little to do with impact analysis ; what type of impact analysis are those?	We disagreed with the reviewer. No specific sample size is suggested in the literature. Eg Ravallion (2001). There are published works with less than 500 observations, e.g. Sofoluwe (2012) This depends on the choice of matching technique. We addressed these two issues in this study as well. We chose probit model and included socioeconomic variables (age, sex, household size, experience) in the model.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	THE WAY FORWARD: The author can use difference in differences to achieve the stated objectives without getting into the semantics of PSM which this paper is grossly lacking.	Tables are relevant. Tables 1&2 describe outcome variable; Tables 3&4 present BAT results, while Tables 7&8 present results on poverty incidence. We did not use DD estimator because there was no baseline data and memory recall could not provide reliable data after over 6 years of implementing the project.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract is too large , editorial issues.	Addressed
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	Yes, poor methodology leading to poor conclusion	Disagreed giving the foregoing.