



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12667
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved soyabeen technologies in processing and utilization adoption as supplement with local foods in Bauchi Local Government Area, Bauchi State, Nigeria

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<u>COMPULSORY</u> The author attended to only part of the issues raised and decided to ignore others. While the objective 1 is to determine the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, the hypothesis tested was on the effect of socioeconomic factors on adoption of improved technologies. Author should reword the objective so that it falls in line with the results. There are no results on objective to "To identify problems that is hindering the adoption of improved soyabeen technologies". I however saw reference to this objective in the discussion. As long as this third objective "To create awareness about the usefulness of soyabeen in human diets through supplementation with local foods" I would naturally expect some results on this. <u>MINOR</u> Line 14 was not addressed as the author claimed in his response. The statements means "from each of the three selected villages, 15 farmers we chosen to participate in the survey" but its not clearly saying so. Line 17 – not reading properly. There is repetition. Reword. :Line 19 – grammar Line 20 – delete the highlighted part Line 26 and others with similar observation. The p-value is not in brackets as suggested but author claimed to have corrected. Author to read other correctly written articles for her/ him to familiarise with the presentation. Line 30 – New sentence	The 'factor' here is referring to socio-economic characteristics Table 5 has been added showing the problems hindering the adoption of improved soyabeen technologies Table 5 shows that there was inadequate awareness about the usefulness of soyabeen in human diets, so there could be no results. Further studies may reveal more than this Line 14 has been reconstructed Done Line 19 has been corrected Line 20- highlighted part has been removed It may be an oversight, the brackets have been added as suggested Line 30 has been corrected



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Line 52 – delete the highlighted Line 53 – add “ of Soybean” Line 63 – grammar “ that are” Line 72- To read “ the study area has a tropical climate” Line 74 – reword – to read “five months, ranging from” Line 75 – It was previously suggested that it’s nicer if you start with the lower temperature and then the higher. In the response, author claimed to have corrected. Line 99 – to read farm size (ha) Line 102 – If the word “technologies is the same as “innovations”, this was shown in the introduction and author to avoid repeating the inclusion of innovations in brackets throughout.	Line 52- It seems you used the old copy of the work. There was no sentence or phrase highlighted on line 52 in the latest copy I sent. Line 53- ‘of soyabean’ added to line 59 The line 72 you quoted is now on line 86, the correction has been done This has been done For Line 75 it seems there is a mix up with the old copy. Please check the correction had been done as claimed (that is minimum before maximum) This has been done Line 102 now line 114, the correction has been done
--	--