



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_13759
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints to Increasing Soybean Production and Productivity in Benue State, Nigeria
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	In the sentence of the Introduction: "Soy is also medicinal and is extremely useful in the fight against heart disease, cancer and diabetes, as well as the loss of body mass in people living with HIV / AIDS", I would say that AIDS is a kind of disease not to mention that would be indicated as induce false interpretation of fighting disease. About the outcome: "The educational situation shows that most respondents had primary education (35.9%) and others had secondary education (27.5%) and higher education (10.8%), while 25.8 % had no formal education. This implies that the majority (84.2%) of soybean producers were educated. "This result was not well placed, it can be said that most have minimal notion of schooling, but it is not correct to say that 84.2% of farmers have highly educated, as 35.9% of respondents had access only to primary education. Outdated references, and it would be recommended that the references were to a maximum of five years.	This has been done. Note that the percentages for the three levels of education (primary, secondary and tertiary) were summed up to get 84.2%. I disagree with you as references that are beyond 5 years are still relevant.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	About the high cost of inputs, could have better exploited the exposure that this result was impactfull. Subsection on "Problems of Production" is well positioned and good exposition of ideas, and very consistent, I evaluate how great this part of the text. The author could have better discussed about the following issues: Lack/poor market infrastructure,unavallabillity and highe cost of farm inputs, poor knowledge of improved production techniques, high cost of transportation I thought it was a good piece of suggestions for improvements, but failed to mention about promoting training programs for farmers and other programs that provide solutions to problems of food security flaws and lack of knowledge about the processes of planting.	This has been done. All these have been taken care of.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The objective of the article was reached, but the article raised questions about results that could have been better discussed, in addition to being used outdated references for the most part and this fact is a serious problem to get a real response of the statements and discussions results.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author can add more updated references in the text and discuss in more depth the findings in the article.	I have added more updated references and discussed in more depth the findings.