



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26261
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES SELECTIONS AND ADOPTIONS OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN THE COTTON BASIN OF BENIN
Type of the 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	The introductory section is good, but the review of the literature should be broadened to include relevant theoretical and empirical studies on small farmers' adoption. The introduction and the results should be developed in a more integrated framework. At present, the general discussion is too abstract. The whole presentation should pay more attention to the nexus between theory and empirical tests. The paper now lacks a theoretical model or at least a section on the specific theoretical underpinnings of the empirical work. As a consequence, the interpretation of the econometric results appears entirely "ad hoc" and does not conform to any acceptable protocol of hypothesis testing. Expected signs should be specified a priori and the related hypotheses related to theoretical model or at least to theory based considerations. The endogenous nature of many independent variables should be recognized, discussed and dealt with in the econometric estimation.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Use of the words "verify" and "invalidate" should be more careful. A statistical test can perhaps claim to	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	confirm the result of earlier tests, but cannot “invalidate” them.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work presented appears interesting, but it seems rather the first stage of a research work which should be further developed.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pasquale Lucio Scandizzo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Center for International Economic Studies (CEIS) and Economics Foundation, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy</i>