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** *(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		
Minor REVISION comments	Some sentence forms should be corrected because of inversions and missing words. There should be some word, punctuation, conjunction corrections, additions and changes. For example: Line 35 – "suggestion of the fact that?" Line 9 and line 146- "the demand of fish was relatively ……..price and income…" line 92- "who found a negative…"- is there a wrong relative clause? Line 113- usage of the fact that Line 114- with that of Line 122- word order	
Optional/General comments	An informative study on the determinants for fish consumption. Thank you.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**M. Goksel Akpinar**
Department, University & Country	**Akdeniz University Faculty of Agriculture Agricultural Economics Department, Turkey**