



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_19347
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF PRICE TRANSMISSION OF FOOD GRAINS ALONG THE FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH BETWEEN PRIOR AND POST TRADE LIBERALIZATION ERA IN TANZANIAN CONTEXT
Type of the Article	Short 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 the abstract, could you please specify the type of quantitative research design used? Did you cover the whole country during the empirical research? If no, why then you used 2 years (2012-2013) for your research Line 30, write "price difference is high" Line 31, write "price difference is low" In paragraph from line 41 to line 51, you need to cite the authors of the idea. Line 60: you must say something about the first data before the second data. Otherwise the idea won't be complete. In line 120, you are telling us about another prior trade liberalisation era (1981-1995) while in line 41, the prior trade liberation era is in 1960's. Is it not contradictory? You need to clarify this statement. Line 123 and line 124, in your formulas the 2 of x_2 is far away from X, please correct it. Line 171, it should be "price transmission of food grains prior trade liberalization era were positively correlated with dry beans ($r=0.9802$), rice ($r=0.9750$) etc..". It cannot be correlated with correlation coefficient as stated but because of the value of r, X is correlated to Y. You do not interpret the positive correlation your results revealed in results and discussion section but surprisingly you did it in the conclusion. Please explain it in the section of results and discussion and do find a way to shorten it in the conclusion section Nowhere you did	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mention in the text what the difference between the correlations mean or stand for. You did just back up your results with only two authors which to very few in discussion section.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vincent Ishola Awe EZIN</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Agriculture, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin</i>