



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13321
Title of the Manuscript:	POVERTY REDUCTION IN NIGERIA: LESSONS FROM SMALL SCALE FARMERS OF NIGER AND KOGI STATES
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is an interesting paper that demonstrates originality and contribution to the field. In general, the authors have utilized a lot of statistical techniques to present the findings which in fact is highly recommended. I would recommend publishing the paper with minor revisions outlined below: <u>Abstract</u> 1. The authors have clearly indicated the purpose of the study in the abstract but they need to go beyond that to briefly describe the methods used (e.g. sampling, instruments used etc). <u>Introduction section</u> 2. The background is good except that the authors need to clearly delineate the scope and justification of the study. 3. The authors talked about structural adjustment programme as a poverty reduction tool implemented in Nigeria to alleviate poverty but I think the authors could also comment on the recent poverty intervention strategies adopted by the state	Accept and corrected Accepted and corrected Accepted and corrected

	and perhaps a quick evaluation of their outcomes. This if well done could go to justify why this study is worth doing. 4. The authors have made the effort to indicate the general poverty situation among developing countries but I think it would have been a plus if they could make the effort to briefly review literature regarding the actual poverty situation in Nigeria particularly among small scale farmers in the study areas. Maybe, census data of Nigeria can help. <u>Materials and methods</u> Methodology is a key component of any empirical research. In that regard, the methodology needs to be clearly formulated and developed: 5. The information about the study settings is relevant but the authors probably have to give a vivid justification of why they chose the two study settings in Nigeria (Niger and Kogi States). 6. The authors should indicate the philosophy guiding the study even though from the methods used one can predict it. 7. The sampling technique employed is good but the authors need to clearly formulate the sampling procedure. For instance, look at this statement.... “then random selection of <i>at least six</i> farming households in each	Accept and corrected Accept and corrected They were mistakes in the computation of sample size in the initial write up but it has been corrected.
--	--	--

	village”. Here, precision is lost. We need to know how the sample size of 540 farming households was arrived at. 8. The authors mentioned that the observation method was used but they failed to report on what was observed particularly on the results. 9. Still on instruments, the authors also indicated that structured questionnaires and interview schedules were used to gather the data from the field. But this appears a bit confusing to me. The question that comes to mind is: why the use of both questionnaires and interview schedules? For me, the difference between them lies in their mode of administration, that is whether self-administered or administered by the researcher. If indeed the two were used maybe reasons could be adduced. For instance, an interview schedule could be used in a study if the population is illiterate. <u>Results and discussions</u> 10. The results and discussion section was well presented. In particular, the indices used to present the results were fantastic and more revealing. <u>Conclusion</u> 11. A little of the methods used in the study should be briefly outlined at the conclusion	It was a mistake and it has been corrected It has been clearly explained Accept and corrected
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	section e.g. sampling and sample size, instruments used etc to serve as a reminder to readers on how the study was conducted. <u>References</u> 12. The references should be adjusted according to the journal requirements e.g. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Authors should visit the journal website for this.	Accept and corrected
--	---	-----------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The authors should recast the opening sentence of the introductory part of the manuscript. It appears a bit dangling.	Accept and corrected
	2. The use of the pronoun “he” instead of the names of authors should be replaced with the authors’ surnames followed by the years of publication.	Accept and corrected
	3. Provide sources for serious statements made especially when statistics are involved. For instance, from line 82 to 92 requires some theoretical backings.	The sources are scarce but the statement has been reframed.
	4. The sentence starting from Line 99 to 108 appears too long and should be abridged.	Accept and corrected
	5. The section on methodology should be titled “Materials and Methods” or “Data and Methods”.	Accept and corrected
	6. Authors should use the symbol “&” when the citation is inside the bracket e.g. this citation given (Addison and Cornia, 2001) could be recited as (Addison & Cornia,	Accept and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2001)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a good paper that requires minor revision to make it more impactful.	Accept and corrected
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	Authors could indicate in the work how ethical issues were handled with respect to the data collection and the literature reviewed.	None