SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_AJEA_6502**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Impact of Migrant Remittances on the Output of Arable Crop of Farm Households in South Eastern Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Original research papers**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	References: the references are excessive, and many of them are quite old, with latest ones being 2004. Don't we have some works done between 2004 and 2013? An updated of the references would be appropriate. Can you focus on the most important and latest references such that you have between 10-15 rather than the more than 30 you have. Some are actually similar and should be dropped out.	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 36 to date not till date; line 65 shoud this not be et al; line 112-114 rephrase for clarity; in line 148 I don't see where purposive comes in, simply drop the word, line 158 justify the cost route versus others in same sentence, 169 rephrase for clarity, line 178 correct the year, lines 183-184 reduce the number of citations if they are all addressing the same issue preferably stay with the latest ones, line 197 and elsewhere maintain consistency in the tense of reporting see also 203, 216, 232, 276. Line 231 rephrase; 233 coefficients is plural; see 244 thatwas; line 258 could those that have less capital be using more labor (more of substituting capital for labor) with negative effect on productivity?; line 263-265 not clear; conclusion section: the implications are quite general and target policy, there are no implications for the individuals involved in the remittances, don't they have a role they can also play? And should the remittances be promoted?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer