



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4679
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio economy Adoption Process of Agro-biotechnology Among Researchers in Nigerian Universities/Research Institutes: The Logistics Regression Approach
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlight <i>that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i>)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- The methodology section (estimation procedure) is not clearly explained. None of the variables, including both dependent and independent variables, are defined. This is very important because the author must imply the results from these variables. The author must explain the motivations/hypotheses of the variables used in the model; otherwise, the methodology will not be justified, and the whole arguments of results and discussion are irrelevant. In addition, if this model is built based upon economic theory, it should be linked to economic model such as random utility theory. - Check the reference and logit model equations. The author use Adeogun et al, 2008 as the main reference, but it is a research article. Textbook or books with rigorous model should be used i.e. Discrete Choice Method with Simulation (Train, 2009) and Applied Choice Analysis (Hensher et al., 2005) - Some modelling equations must be carefully verified i.e. eq (3) summation of j subscription should be changed from 5 to j. - The discussion of results on page 5 until the end of Table 1 is irrelevant from the results of the model and perhaps can be deleted or discussed in complementing statistical analysis, but not using prior information to be claimed results from this study. - The amount of fund is interpreted as a financial status in Rogers (1995) and other technology adoption. This might not be the case of biotechnology since initial investment i.e. to build laboratory and other research infrastructure can be	Reviewed accordingly (corrections done in the main text). Dependent and independent variable are defined Reviewed accordingly (corrections done in the main text). motivations/hypotheses of the variables used in the model has been justified. Train 2009 and Guanming et al, 2013 been reviewed accordingly. 5 has been changed j accordingly. The discussion of results on page 5 until the end of Table 1 has been discussed in complementing statistical analysis and been revised accordingly. Amount of fund has been changed to financial status in the main text and reviewed accordingly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	prohibitively high so that funding (which the reviewer not sure how it is defined) appear not to influence the decision to adopt biotechnology while in fact it does. Other discussions of the results are highly recommended to be interpreted in the context of research and development and not necessarily application or adoption of technology.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Although attempted, agricultural biotechnology research in Nigeria has not been sufficiently illustrated to see what are the problems or contributions of this sector to poverty and food security as it is understood to be the motivation of this paper. It is suggested that this must be elaborated and also the results should provide implications regarding this issue. - Conceptual framework should highlight the problems mentioned above to the methodology and how the results can be used to tackle this problem. It is suggested to revise this section. - Keywords are inappropriate. Keywords closely related to the main content of the article should be used.	Reviewed accordingly (corrections done in the main text). Reviewed accordingly (corrections done in the main text).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The title is bio economy, but it has not been defined and not really represented the whole context. - The author use agricultural biotechnology and agro-biotechnology interchangeably. If they are the same, one should be used thoroughly to avoid confusion. - The author use the definition of “biotechnologies” following CBD (line 96- 98); however, modern biotechnology is what is paper is analyzed. If that the case, the definition of biotechnology should be spelled out more clearly, and discuss in details. - Some references appear to be strange i.e. Hossain (p. 9 line 409 or Hussain (p. 2 line 50). Page 2 line 55-57 mentioned general problems, but two references are specific to Nigeria.	Reviewed accordingly (corrections done in the main text).