



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7826
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF MARKET PARTICIPATION AMONG MAIZE PRODUCERS IN OYO 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Some of the cited authors are not included in the bibliography (e.g. Barret (2007), Boughton et al (2007)) and for some when included in the bibliography; they are not consistent with what's in the paper itself. For example, page 2 of the paper cited Holloway and Ehui (2005), but the bibliography shows Holloway, G, Barret and S Ehui (2005). Barret is included. There is no consistency in the bibliography. Some authors include their full names and surnames while others only include their initials and surname. This must be corrected Please note that Thinah Moyo should be cited as Moyo (2010) and not as Thinah (2010). The bibliography should also be amended to reflect this (i.e Moyo, 2010) The article should be edited to correct some language mistakes e.g "An hectare increase in farm size increases the quantity sold by 185.6kg".This should read as "A hectare increase....."	The bibliography has been corrected and revised accordingly



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	In addition to the objectives of the study which is captured in the last part of the introduction, the author should consider including how those objectives are going to be met (i.e. methodology in brief) as well as the paper outline (i.e. road map). This will give the reader an indication of what to expect in the paper. The methodology has been explained in detail in the paper but my view is that the introduction (as the name indicates) should also introduce it briefly. I would suggest that the 'Policy recommendation' section be subsumed into the 'CONCLUSION' and those policy recommendations should not be numbered, rather put bullets. I was intrigued by policy recommendation 3 (encouraging farmers to go to school). The average age of sampled farmers is 53 while their year of formal education is 7 years. The word 'school' is vague. Is the author referring to formal schooling?. If so, with my experience (it might be different in Nigeria though) and considering their age, I think the best for these farmers is on-farm training and this therefore talks to the strengthening of extension services by government which the author should perhaps try to consider as a recommendation. Formal education will provide a generic type of education which won't address their immediate need (i.e maize farming) and the impact of this formal education might be felt after some years and by then they will be too old or reached the 'unproductive years'. The author should perhaps consider revisiting this policy recommendation before state funds are considered for what has been proposed. Page 7 of the article has a table of variables with priori expectation. The author should consider giving it a table name and the layout should be like other tables. The current layout is not user friendly because the following headings; '<i>variables, description and expected signs</i>' looks like they are part of those factors listed below each heading whereas in other tables they are in bold and they have their own row separated with lines	The objectives have been highlighted in the paper. The main method of analyses is the market participation model aside the usual descriptive statistics. The suggestion is taken and the paper is reworked to reflect this. The word school refers to formal schooling. The recommendation is adjusted to reflect on farm training, adult education/literacy. Has been corrected.
---------------------------------------	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I am not sure if the author has adequately acknowledged sources of information under the section headed "Theory of Utility". Since this is the theoretical background/framework, one would have expected a lot of sources included/cited under this section unless if the author himself/herself invented this theory. The author must make sure that (s)he has fully acknowledged sources of his/her information on the theory of utility Regarding keywords, is it necessary to have both Nigeria and Oyo State as key words? How about including 'market accesses as one of the keywords rather than having both Nigeria and Oyo State. How about also including one of THE methodologies (Heckman or Tobit) as a keyword.	We do not consider this necessary as the Theory of Utility can be found in any economics textbook. We have removed Oyo State and determinants. Also, we have included Tobit model since it was chosen as the model with the best fit.
--	---	---