



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14499
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE PRODUCTIVITY ANALYSIS OF CASSAVA ENTERPRISES BY PROJECT AND NON-PROJECT WOMEN FARMERS 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In line 309-311, the coefficient of agrochemicals was positive and significant in ADP regression but negative and insignificant in non-ADP regression. This implies that unit increase in this variable will not affect non-ADP output but will tend to increase ADP output, and vice versa. This conforms to [29] that use of agricultural technology such as agrochemicals increase productivity. Your argument here was not well presented or do you mean if a farmer uses an agrochemical at the recommended rate, his or her output will not increase because of non-involvement in ADP project. In Lines 313-316, the coefficient of farm size was positive and significant in ADP regression but negative and insignificant in that of non-ADP. This implies that unit increase in farm size will not affect non-ADP output; but will tend to increase output of ADP respondents and <i>vice versa</i>. The interpretation of this data is giving a wrong impression, although, the data presented may indicate your view but you have to present a convincing argument to back-up your findings.	The review comments in respect of line 309-311 have been noted and corrections have been made accordingly. The review comments on line 313-316 are clearly understood. Efforts have been made to present a better interpretation of the data with respect to farm size.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Quoting the author from the abstract, Using descriptive statistics, chi-square analysis, ordinary least square regression technique, and data from 87 project (ADP) and 87 non-project (non-ADP) women farmers in Benue State, we estimated and compared productivities, and identified determinants of productivity among respondents. I THINK “AND” IN THE STATEMENT ABOVE INDICATED THAT THE AUTHOR MAY WANT TO ADD ANOTHER STATISTICAL TOOL USED IN THE ANALYSIS OR IS IT AN OVERSIGHT? 2. Provision of provide basic infrastructure such as goods rural water supply, good roads, rural electricity, This sentence in line 380 needs to be corrected.	The comment has been noted and corrections made as highlighted. The corrections have been effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		