



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_21507
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving food security in sub-Saharan Africa: lessons from the Chinese experience
Type of the Article	Review 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	No. 2 & 3, the title of the paper should be in CAPS, to be in conformity with the rest of the major sections. No. 8, the Keywords should be arranged alphabetically. No. 27, authors need to specify number of decades instead of the use of SEVERAL..... No. 98, author needs to replace “are” with “were” No. 101, the word “overall” should be “Overall” i.e. with “O” cap. No. 105, the “<i>et al.</i>” should be in italic, and since its outside parenthesis, the “comma” after “dot” should be deleted. That should go for all “<i>et al.</i>” No. 118, adjust values in the table to the right to align with sub-title. No. 124, “attributes” should be “attributed” No. 125, authors are supposed to specify/elaborate on the INCENTIVE SYSTEM due to its relevance to the study. What are the component(s) proper? No. 127, authors need to specify these MARKET REFORMS that led to higher prices to producers.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Nos. 157-159, how China's agrarian reforms through institutional factors directly affected the farming communities that actually created the growth has not been adequately established. Author needs to do that, since this is supposed to serve as lessons for developing economies (SSA). No. 170, add "s" to "show" to read "shows" No. 171, insert "than" between "more" and "20%" No. 174, insert apostrophe after "s" in "regions" No. 181, replace "is to" with "as". Then insert comma after "expected" No. 201, insert "are" after "seeds" No. 207, insert comma after "Yet" No. 216, insert comma after "result" No. 281, delete last "s" in "illustrates" No. 303, add apostrophe after "regions" No. 318, title of figure should be below it, just before "source", unless it's the Journal's policy. No. 326 & 327, use acronyms of CAADP and NEPAD directly, as the two are already defined in the INTRODUCTION. No. 346 & 347, authors need to briefly mention these policy and institutional barriers that inhibit government	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	investments. No.381, "Institution rule' [30]" seems to be out of place, or there is a missing link. No. 419, CONCLUSIONS: the authors are supposed to draw conclusion(s) from the MAJOR THRUST(s) of the paper ONLY since it's a review work. No reviews, no summary, no citation/referencing again, and no personification. For instance, from "423, we have also..... to 425, ... and spur growth" is not necessary. Similarly, from "435, Obviously, some scholars to 444, telecommunication [29], is also not necessary. Perhaps, these inclusions made the conclusion to be too lengthy. Authors need to recast this section in line with the suggestion, please.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In spite of the comments made above, the authors worth commendation for a very good and comprehensive work on the subject matter: Broad in spectrum, rich in referencing and articulated write-up.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad R. Ja'afar-Furo
Department, University & Country	Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria