



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10839
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Price Transmission and Market Integration of Pawpaw and Leafy Telfairia in Akwa Ibom Sate, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please see below.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please see below.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The paper adopts standard empirical analysis cluster to reach the conclusion: correlation coefficient- unit root- cointegration-causality-IR. The methodologies adopted are convincible. 2. The Lit review is adequate. 3. The data is with sufficient frequency monthly, but I am a little concerned about the number of bos and the length of the window: January 2005 to September 2013 is not a long period. It would be a good improve if the author can increase the degrees of freedom, and VAR/VECM are used to depict long term relations. 4. The writing and develop of the paper is fine-classical steps. But the reading process is not enjoyable-please	The study make used of the available data in the state. We intend to expand the data based when they are available. It is done. thanks



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sub-divide the overlong paragraphs and focus on the results one paragraph after another. 5. I hope the author can focus more on the policy recommendation section. The author mentioned that “Based on the discoveries of this study, it is recommended that, the Akwa Ibom State government should continue to make available marketing infrastructures especially in the rural areas to improve the symmetric nature of information among pawpaw and leafy fluted pumpkin markets in the state.” We would like to see more detailed policies of finalizing the market infrastructures, e.g., the pricing mechanism, the regulation of market participations, the price transmission pipeline, etc. 6. For table 4, the author needs to specify how the significance tests are done for Pearson CC: is it still $t = r \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1-r^2}}?$ 7. Please add the IP charts. We would like to see the band of standard deviation and the H0.	We hope we have focused on the domain of our results. In the study area, market mechanism determines the price of commodities. So we are avoiding recommendations that will conflict with the existing economy system of the study area. We used SPSS SOFTWARE to generate these results. So we did not checked which of the formulae was employed by the software.
--	---	---