



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6428
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Analysis of Fish Consumption in Rivers 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author should present the number of consumers or sample size and percentages of the variables instead of their means and standard deviations as stated in Table 2. In other words, present the socio-economic characteristics of the fish consumers in the study area in a frequency table.	The sample size has been provided. Their percentages have been provided. The socio-economic characteristics of the consumers have been provided frequency in frequency table (see Table 2)
Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Line 6, " the author should state the instrument of data collection" Line 6, ".....cross sectional data generated from 210 respondents randomly selected from the three senatorial zones were used" Should read "cross sectional data were randomly collected	Cross sectional data were randomly collected from 210 respondents from the three senatorial zones.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	from 210 respondents from the three senatorial zones”. Line7, “..... multiple regression analysis should read “multiple regression analysis” Line 9, “.....the demand for fish was relatively price and income inelastic”..... In your study, price of fish never affected the quantity demanded. Why do you say it is relatively price, Think about it? Line 10, “.....the demand for fish was relatively price should be removed since price of fish was not significant. Line 10, “.....substitute to fish as an increase in the price of beef leads to increase in the quantity of fish demanded” should read “substitute to fish therefore, any increase in the price of beef leads to a corresponding increase in the quantity of fish demanded”. INTRODUCTION The problem and the objective of the study are original, important and well defined. Line 34, the author should present a table for the period “ 1960-2008” Line 34, ...’1960-2008” periods and showed	Multiple regression analysis The demand for fish was relatively income inelastic. Done Substitute to fish therefore, any increase in the price of beef leads to a corresponding increase in the quantity of fish demanded. Table has been provided (see Table 1).
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	that the fishing sub-sector made the list contributions to the agriculture share of the GDP” should read “ 1960- 2008 periods showed that the fishery sub-sector made the least contributions to the agriculture share of the GDP. MATERIALS AND METHODS The method used by the author in this study is appropriate. Sufficient details have been provided to allow peer evaluation and replication of the work. Line 50-54, ... The number of Local Government selected was not stated clearly. How many are they are very important before listing them. Line 50, ...the author said one LGA was randomly selected from each senatorial zone, how? The author used both purposive and random selection for the study NOT random alone. Line 57-58” the double log model was specified and used in the analysis” should be remove since four production functional forms; linear, semi-log, double-log and exponential functions were used.	1960-2008 periods showed that the fishery sub-sector was among the least contributors to the agriculture share of the GDP. There are 23 LGAs in the state made up of fifteen upland and 8 Riverine LGAs. One LGA was purposively selected from each senatorial zone. The double log model was specified analysis has been deleted.
--	---	---

	Line 62....."Log $Q_{fish} = \log_a + b_1 \log X_1 + b_2 \log X_2 + b_3 \log X_3 + b_4 \log X_4 + b_5 \log X_5 + b_6 \log X_6 + e$----- (1) should read $Q_{fish} = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + b_4 X_4 + b_5 X_5 + b_6 X_6 + e$----- (1) RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS The data are well controlled and robust. The author has provided relevant references in his/her discussion. The discussion and conclusions are based on actual facts and figures. Statistical analysis is required for this paper. Line 77, ".....they also positively correlated with the quantity of fish demanded" should read " they were also positively correlated with the quantity of fish demanded". Line 85-86, " and shall be used for further analysis of the data" should read " for further discussions. Line 157, " the Table 2 only discusses "elasticity" but descriptive statistics variable has not been deal with.	$Q_{fish} = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4 + b_5 x_5 + b_6 x_6 + e$ They were also positively correlated with the quantity of fish demanded. For further discussion The descriptive statistics has now been dealt with.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION Line 146, “.....Beef was a close substitute to fish as an increase in the price of beef leads to increase in the quantity of fish demanded” should read “ Beef was a close substitute to fish therefore, any increase in the price of beef leads to a corresponding increase in the quantity of fish demanded”. CONCLUSIONS The conclusion is supported by the data presented inside the manuscript. REFERENCES All the references cited are relevant and adequate.	Beef was a close substitute to fish therefore, any increase in the price of beef leads to a corresponding increase in the quantity of fish demanded.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		