



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_8261
Title of the Manuscript:	Soybean Supply Response for Food Security Dynamics in Nigeria: An ECM Approach
Type of the Article	Case Study

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	Title line 2: The word “dynamics” is ambiguous should be specific: “Soybean Supply Response to Food Security policies in Nigeria: An ECM Approach” or Nerlovian approach Abstract Line 7: response to food security is unambiguous. I guess it should be response to food security policies. Generally the abstract should be concise, bearing the following in mind, the purpose of the study, the methodology, summary of the findings, and conclusion. There are few grammatical errors and uncomfortable sentences. Introduction Lines 33 – 36: the sentence is too compounded. Government.....It should be scientific and simple. Also lines 37 – 39 the dependency..... The sentences should be scientific and not journalisitic In much of the lines, the role of expanded soybean acreage, output and choices appears to be hidden. To bring out the quality of the work, the introduction should commence from line 58 uptill line 78. This will gives a clearer picture of the background: soybean supply response to food security policies. Conceptual development	1. The title has been modified and the word dynamics removed 2. Corrected 3. Thas has been corrected also 4. Abstract has been corrected with the grammatical errors. 5. The abstract has been shortened to 245 words with a proper organisation following the purpose of the study, the methodology, summary of the finding and conclusion. 6. Those lines are now changed to reflect the true meanings. Check the corrected version. 7. The sentences in line 33 to 36 has been simplyfied while the sentence in line 37 to 39 is restructured 8. The comment in line 58 to 78 has been corrected. 9. The expected correction in line 83 has been effect.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 83: this should be theoretical/conceptual framework	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The equations should be reformatted with equation editor to make it look original. Secondly since the issue is about response of soybean supply to food security policies. It will be nice to have a brief section on some of the food security policies formulated in Nigeria so far.	10. All equations in the study were formatted with equation editor.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The theoretical framework captures the “Nerlovian approach” rather than the “ECM approach” I guess the title should be “the Nerlovian approach” The ECM is more of a technique that has emerged to estimate the Nerlovian approach. However, if the author wishes to retain ECM in the title, then emphasis should be on ECM in the conceptual development.	11. The study reviewed both Nerlovian Model and ECM were extensively. The value added to this study is the ECM approach that only corrects the time effect inherent in the series included in Nerlove Model. 12. However, the title has changed with both ECM and Nerlove hidden.