



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJAEES_16878
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Daily Collector Systems in Financing Development of Small scale Rural Agribusiness in Delta State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Manuscript

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	Abstract- The abstract is well written it has captured all relevant information that should be part of the abstract. The author has concluded his study but failed to give recommendation. Give one recommendation after your conclusion. Usually in scientific research abstracts are not written in italics. Line 7: Spelling mistake smallholder agribusiness not smallholder agribusinessr Results and Discussion From line 181-185 should be removed and write down the abbreviations in their full words in table 2 where you have SDA, DA,A, SA and UDA Conclusion and Recommendations is the most appropriate way of writing not Conclusion/Recommendations References: The author need to cross check the references before publishing.	i) Recommendation has been given. ii) Abstract is no longer italicized. iii) Smallholder agribusiness is now correctly spelt. iv) Lines 181-185 have been removed and re-written; and the abbreviations are written in full. v). Conclusion and Recommendations. Vi). The author has cross check the references
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper and well written in the sense the author has followed principles of social research. I am impressed with the structured of the paper. The paper is concise, clear and readable.	