



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	The title should be reworked. The following title is suggested: Soybean Supply Response to Price and Non-price Factors in Nigeria. The paper should draw implications for food security which is one of the key objective of the Agricultural transformation Agenda of the present civilian administration in Nigeria. Where is the structure or organisation of the paper? This should come at the end of the introductory section. What are the objectives the paper set out to achieve. This should also come towards the end of the introductory section. Conceptual development should be changed to Conceptual Issues or Conceptual Framework and Review of Literature. Review of literature should identify the gap in literature the present paper intends to fill up. This gap could be in the error correction methodological approach of the paper which is an improvement on the Nerlovian supply model. This area of improvement in the model should be indicated and emphasized by the paper. What is the per capita protein requirement of the population? What is the contribution of Soyabean to this protein requirement? This is the aspect of food security implication of the paper. What are the food insecurity implications of instability in the supply of soybeans over the decades. Can you carry out a comparative analysis of this instability in supply before and after SAP or before and after policy reform or before and after economic liberalization so as to isolate the influence of different policy regime on the supply dynamics. Will there be any significant difference in the regression parameters across the different policy regime. Policy Recommendations of this paper should be clear, specific	1. The title has been modified to "Soybean Supply Response to Price and Non-price Factors in Nigeria: Implications for Food Security". 2. Paragraph 1, lines 34 to 39 has drawn the issue of the present transformation agender to soybean supply response and food security 3. The issue was concisly discussed in paragraph 2 of the introduction, from line 47 to line 63. I tried to linked food supply flunctuations or dynamics to food insecurity. 4. The study has a good structure or organizationas now as you requested requested. Check the 3rd, which is the last paragraph in the introduction as it drew it out explicitly. The objective of the study is well spelt out and seperated from the research questions. See lines 69 to 76 5. Conceptual Development has been changed to Conceptual framework and review of literature 6. The conceptual issue has been addressed check between lines 108 and 119 of the revised work 7. The study did not look at per cpita protein requirement but the actual demand deficit that created a gap



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and should be implementable. The way they are now, they are appear to be vague.	between planned supply and actual supply, hence the reason for food insecurity as the study wants to address. This has been supplied in conceptual framework 8. The study cannot do a comparative review at different policy regime now. That objective will add much extra cost, which the authors cannot carry now.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	There is evidence of plagiarism in line 37 to 39. Also some words are omitted or verb wrongly used. The word response in the following phrase could be respond: “agricultural output supply response to these variables with a lapse of time”. These lines should be reworked and should be clear without any ambiguity and plagiarism. Line 40 contains spelling error in the word variable, but not variable Spelling errors in line 40(society), Lines 58 and 59 are clumsy and unclear. Line 62 contains repetition in the word “an”. Spelling error in line 68. “insisant”. Spelling errors in line 70 to 71. Line 75 contains wrong use of the word movements which should be movement. Line 95 is vague. Line 121 contains spelling error(previous), Line contains omission of word in “level of” Insert the word relevant before journals in line 163. Line 176 is confusing. Line 178 should be “ All the variables” Statements in line 224 and 225 are clumsy. Please explain the percentage changes clearly. The description of your trend analysis in terms of percentage changes should be done without ambiguity. The way you describe the trend gives room for ambiguity. There is spelling error in line 236. Some inferences drawn from the trend analysis seem to be vague and not well supported by facts . For instance, see lines 235 to 239. Do you equate relative index of soyabean supply to relative contribution of soyabean output supply to aggregate food supply? Where is the variable representing Aggregate food supply? This equivalence may be erroneous as the information in table 2 do not give any variable that indicates aggregate food supply. The author should note that trend in Soybean contribution to total Agricultural gross domestic product is not equivalent to contribution of soybeans supply to aggregate food supply. Similarly the author should note that agricultural gross domestic product is not equal to aggregate food supply. It appears that the author is confusing soybean supply variable with	However, it has brought out a food security policy implication. Check lines 316 to 348 Lines 37 to 39 have been rephrased to reduce the ambiguity while the wrong spelling in line 40 corrected The spelling errors in line 40, 68 70 to 71, 75 and 121 have been corrected while line 58 to 59 are clearer now with the repeated words in line 62 removed. Check lines 171 to 174 for the estimation of percentage changes. The sentence in line 221 to 222 have been rephrased to reduce ambiguity. The variable has been supplied to made the decription relevant. The essence of this representation is not to draw equivalent to total food supply but just to assess the position of soybean to toatal food supply. Expected (planned) soybean supply approximates food security base on the fact that food security denote food availability, accessibility and affordability. All these are built in planned food supply.
---	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	food security variable. Soyabean supply is not the same as food security variable. Elements of food security are availability, accessibility, affordability and adequacy of food. Thus soybean supply is not equivalent to food security variable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper should be published after the major and minor revisions as indicated. The paper contains spelling errors from introduction section to the conclusion section. The policy recommendations and conclusion should be more robust. Policy Recommendation should be more specific without any ambiguity. The Abstracts should be reworked as pointed out on the Abstract that was sent in a separate file name.	