



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6441
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT GUARANTEE SCHEME FUND (ACGSF) ON DOMESTIC FOOD SUPPLY IN 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	Abstract: The abstract of this paper does not address the issues in the topic. It is dealing with issues of food security which is outside the topic of the paper. It should state the problem, identify the method of study, highlight the findings and summarise the recommendations in relation to the topic. Background of the Study: It should be titled as it is here and not Background Information. This paper has not presented its concern. I think it should show how credit access is a problem to domestic food supply and how ACGSF has come to intervene before the evaluation of ACGSF that the paper is doing now. Literature Review: The current review does not address the issues of the topic. It should review the role of ACGSF in domestic food supply generally and as well as Nigeria specifically, showing its advantages and constraints. Sections 3.0 and 3.1 should be removed and replaced by Model Specification with the justifications for the choice of the method over the others. This should be followed by a section titled: Data Presentation, Estimation and Analysis. The Data to be analysed should be presented in the paper. The final section should be titled; Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations. The Summary here is summary of findings from the analysis of data.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many grammatical errors to be corrected. Examples include line 43 "increase instead of increased", line 135 "investigate instead of investigates", line 159 "employ instead of employs", line 160 "exist instead of exists", line 172 "the likes of" is not appropriate, line 175 "show instead of shows" line 178 "only focused on only" is wrong is wrong use of English, and many others.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 29, there should be date after the World Bank, line 38 to 40 should indicate the source(s) of the information, line 82 indicates wrong sourcing of information. I suppose there are articles in the bulletin cited, line 89, Nigeriawiki is not an academic source of information for a paper of this nature, line 110, "however" cannot start a paragraph, line 124, is impact the same thing as effectiveness?	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer