



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6701
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF RICE AS FOOD AND INCOME SECURITY CROP IN PUTI-PUTI SUB COUNTY, PALLISA DISTRICT, UGANDA
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	The authors have included some in-text citations that have not been cited in the Reference Section. For example: World Bank 2001; Bagirwa et al., 2005; Sserunkuuma et al., 2004. Make sure all citations have been included in the proper section	All the citations has been included in the reference list except Sserunkuma et al. 2004 which has been replaced by Hyuha et al. 2005
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the abstract section the summarized results should also appear in the results section. For instance the authors indicate that the reasons for growing rice included tolerance of pests and diseases. Table 6 has no indication of this claim. In the same abstract section under the conclusion section, the authors have used household returns?, am not sure if they mean household cash income as suggested in the title of the topic as well as the aims of the research paper, The authors should be consistent in the use of the words e.g. household food and income security as shown in the abstract and other subsequent sections. Results section: The authors have used rice output on line 94 – how about using rice production On line 96 the authors write “In fact, close to 80% of the respondents... consider revising the sentence. E.g. Infact 76 % of the respondents or Close to 80% of the respondents....”	This has been taken care. What appeared in the abstract was extracted from the results. Table 7 has been inserted to cater for the missing gaps This has been harmonised This has been taken care of in the relevant section as highlighted The change has been effected as highlighted in the text The suggestion has been adopted as highlighted in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 98 – I suggest the author to decide whether they want to use average or range . The wording here is very confusing. Additionally on the same line average productivity – probably it will be easy if the authors could have used average production . Table 1: Household returns --- the topic of this research says “....household income...” how about changing the word returns to cash income On line 99 – the authors has indicated that higher harvest was obtained from first season than the second season (Figure 1). Are there any explanations that respondents gave to support the findings (was there drought in season 2, or reduction in cultivated area etc.). Any qualitative testimonies can also be helpful. From Lines 128 – 135 – I suggest the authors to revise some sentences. In the results section line 132 the authors indicate that some of the reasons for growing rice were availability of land and traditional crop. How about revising this sentence	The suggestion has been adopted has highlighted in the text The word production has been used to replace productivity as highlighted in the text The word returns has been substituted with cash income as highlighted in the text The reasons for the difference has been highlighted in the text The revision has been done as advised see highlighted text This has been addressed as highlighted in the text
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This research paper represents a major effort in assessing the importance of rice as food and income security crop in Puti-Puti sub-county, Pallisa district in Uganda. The methodology consists of cross sectional survey using multi-stage random sampling. The major finding showed that rice is an important commodity in providing household food and income security to the study area. I believe there is potential for this manuscript and do hope the authors will address my comments accordingly.	
---	--	--