



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1910
Title of the Manuscript:	GENDER IMPACTS OF SMALL-SCALE FARM HOUSEHOLDS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIALISATION IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	This is an important topic and relevant to the current context in most developing countries. However I think the author did not do sufficient to address the relevant aim of the paper. In addition there a major methodological flaws in this paper with respect to data analysis. The data collection tool is not detailed sufficiently. As result a reader is not sure about all of the variables on which data was collected. The authors must decide on which term "small-scale" or "smallholder" they wish to use. Do not use them interchangeably. There are grammatical errors which need correcting- see specific points below	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	The title is acceptable. Abstract: Line 8: insert a space before "Results". Line 8: insert the word "the" between "that" and "majority" Line 9: inset a space after "age" Line 10: Insert the word :The" before "Majority" Line 12: insert a space after "were" and "on"	Space closed during conversion from WORD to PDF
Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	Line 34: Insert a space before "Agricultural" Lines 75/76: The words "(used in pesticides)" appear to be inappropriately placed. They should appear after the word "pyrethrum". Lines 105/106: Write this sentence in the past tense since the study has already been conducted. Also re-write as what the authors aimed to achieve. It is currently written as what they have already found. Line 107: Replace "seem" with "were" Lines 111/112: This question should be more focused Lines 108 /112: Write these as objectives and not questions. In addition the objectives require further refinement. Line 115: Change ".....for the study." Into "....in this study." Lines 116/117: This should be re-written as "gender related factors impact negatively on agricultural commercialization among smallholder households in Osun State, Nigeria. NB: The author must provide a definition for " agricultural commercialization" as was used in their study. This very important to	Space was closed during conversion from WORD to PDF



SDI Review Form 1.5

	this study.	
--	-------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.5

Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	References appear adequate. Page numbers are missing on line 379	
Materials & methods (<i>Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work</i>)	The study area is well described. Line 127: "...process" should read as "...processes." Line 129; "NMC" should read as "(NMC)" The data collection tool is not detailed sufficiently. As result a reader is not sure about all of the variables on which data was collected Line 133: The authors speak of "secondary data" being used for the study but there is no secondary data presented in the result section. In addition no detail is provided on what this secondary data is ? Line 137: remove "...etc.". It is best to report all of the variables on which information was collected. Since the authors have not defined "agricultural commercialization", we cannot get a sense of how it was measured. Line 140: insert a space after farmers. Line 141: remove the word "technique". The authors explain the stratified sampling aspects of their stratified random sampling but they do not explain how they randomised the 10 questions within each strata. Line 146: "All the 100..." should read as "All of the..." Line 149: Replace "...will be.." with "was" since this study has already been completed. Note frequency tables are used to described data and not analyse data. Rewrite "mean values" as "means" Line 150: The authors mention "qualitative methods" were used for data analysis but do not provide any further information on this. Please provide information on what qualitative data was collected and what qualitative methods were used for analysis Line 151: Insert "A" before "Linear..." Line 152: Insert "...of.." after "...all..." Line 155/156: Remove the aim of this study from here and insert at the end of the "introduction" section. Line 157: Insert "in" after "...participate..." Line 167: Insert the word "a" after "using..." Line 174: Insert a space before "Data..." Lines 194/195: The dependent variable is a categorical variable but the authors report having performed a linear regression analysis on the data. In order to perform a linear regression analysis the dependent variable has to be a continuous variable. When the dependent variable is a categorical variable then a logistic regression	Space was closed during conversion from WORD to PDF Line 157, 'in' was already inserted Space was closed during conversion from WORD to PDF The model that was used in the study is a hybrid between the



SDI Review Form 1.5

analysis is used. This mater requires careful attention and correction.
Lines 199/200: How is "off farm time" defined? Is this the hours a person spends away from the farm or is it time spent working away from the farm?
Line 210: Define "...food security.."

Logit or Probit and the OLS. The model postulates that the probability (P_i) that a farm household commercializes its crop production is a linear function of all the explanatory variables, X_i . This procedure has been discussed broadly in Tobin (1958), Greene (1993), Maddala, (1988), and Gujarati (1995) and applied in several instances such as Adejobi et al (2006). Both Heckit and Tobit procedures also addressed this concern.



SDI Review Form 1.5

Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)

The results should be presented first followed by a discussion of the results. Currently results and discussion are mixed together and this does not make for easy reading.

Line 216/217: " the.....among others." Should be removed. The variables used to describe socio-economic characteristics belong to the methods.

Line 220: Replace "average" with "mean". Present either the standard deviation or 95% confidence interval for the mean.

Line 226/227: Re-write this following sentence so that it reads clearly: "The older.....as business."

Line 230: Insert a space before "For"

Line 232/234: How did the authors define "productivity" in this study. One cannot use a response rate as an indication of production. Admittedly more males responded than females to the questionnaire but that does not necessarily mean that males produce more than females. Females may not have responded because they happened to be working!!

Line 234: Insert a space after "being.."

Line 236: Replace "giving" with "given"

Line 238: Insert "a" after "on..."

Line 241: "Literatures..." should read as "Literature.."

Line 244/245: Correct the grammar in the sentence "he implication.....as labor."

If you have not collected data on whether farmers use family as labour or not then the sentence on lines 244/245 is a major assumption. One cannot assume that if most respondents were married they would use family as labour.

Line 253: replace "that" with "with a"

Line 259/261: Data relating to adoption rates is neither presented in the tables nor reported in the text but the authors write about adoption rates in terms of other activities being high. If this is the case please report the percentage. Also studying adoption rates for other activities was not an objective of this study so why are the authors reporting this?

Line 263: As pointed out earlier the dependent variable is a categorical variable thus performing a linear regression is incorrect. Thus all results relating to this model cannot be interpreted.

Do not refer to variable as X1, X2 etc. Instead use their correct name when reporting them.

Table 1 : there is no need to present the "cumulative percentages". Please remove them. Indicate that the Age distribution is in "years". Indicate that the "household size" refers to the number of people in the

Space was closed during conversion from WORD to PDF
From all indications, male gross income, No. of hours spent on farm, farm size etc which are indicators of productivity are more for male farmers than female farmers.
Space was closed during conversion from WORD to PDF



SDI Review Form 1.5

	household and not the number of rooms. Is education defined in terms of "years of study"? If so the report as such. Table 2: Since the dependent variable was a categorical variable then logistic regression should have been performed and odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals should have been reported. The current information presented in Table 2 cannot be interpreted.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	None mentioned and none that appear to be the case.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Line 293/294: The authors write " This study approached the issues of the farm household's scarce resources allocation between male and female" but no results reflecting "scarce resources allocation" are reported in the paper. Lines 297/298: "...Hired and family labor...no results for this were presented so how can the authors make conclusions on this? Lines: 298/301" As pointed out a linear regression is the incorrect regression analysis used here so the authors cannot make this conclusion	
References	See above	