



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_27693
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity and Consumption Effects of Population Growth among Smallholder Farmers in Rwanda: A Long-Term Analysis
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article looks sound, with its arguments coherently put together. It however has some minor revisions to make. In section 3.3 (the data description section), lines 5 & 6, the author wrote about '...190 respondents randomly selected...'. Can the author please explain what type of random technique that was referred to? This is because there is more than one random selection process	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Also, in section 3.3, lines 3 to 6, the author should think of reviewing the sentence which begins with 'An extended family dataset...' because it is not clear. The author should as well think of revising the title of the article., because having gone through, it is a bit confusing with respect to the content of the article. Therefore, the author should think of something like: 'Effects of population growth on smallholder farmers' productivity and consumption in Rwanda: a long-term analysis'.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author must consider proper editing of the article, because there are many editing problems associated with it. More so, in section 5 (conclusion section), in the last paragraph, the author's suggestion from line 2, to me, I think it is contradictory. This is because the Boserupian theory (Boserup, 1965 & 1981) which is the basis of this study indicates that there is no need to worry about population because in the long run, population growth will lead to higher standards of living through	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	agricultural intensification and improved productivity. In this regard, the author's findings show that increasing land (farm size) resulted to decreased input and productivity (net farm income), if the author is again talking about 'extending land' in that sentence, I think it is contradictory. What I think the author can do, is to provide a suggestion for further studies. This is because, apparently it is clear that there has to be a cut-off point, beyond which the Boserupian hypothesis will no longer hold. Hence, there is a need for a further study to determine this.	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ighodaro Ikponmwosa David</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Agricultural Economics and Extension Department, University of Fort Hare, South Africa</i>