



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12018
Title of the Manuscript:	RESOURCE USE AND TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY IN VALUE ADDITION TO CASSAVA: A CASE STUDY ON GARI AND FUFU PROCESSING IN OGUN 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Need to follow the journal style on references Readers must be able to understand this presentation.	I agree with the reviewer and the error has been corrected. The format approved by the Journal has been followed. Please see lines 367-398.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 89 requires references Re-frame lines 50-52 and avoid direct copying of cited authorities.	References have been provided for the statements made in line 89. See line 74 (Reference Numbers 9,10 and 11). Lines 50-52 have been reframed as suggested. See lines 35 – 37.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The discussion is not clear	I do not agree with the Reviewer on this comment. It is vague. The area of the discussion that is not clear is not stated. However, we have explained the grey area for a better understanding. See the section on Empirical Results and Conclusion.