



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Several words in this manuscript maybe incorrect: "variable" in line 40 ,maybe "variables". "attension" in line 41 ,maybe "attention". "seociety" in line 41 ,maybe "society". The meaning of "piriori" in line 178 is unclear. "farmers" in line 218, maybe " farmers' " "favourably" in line 219 is unclear. "19681- 1985" in line 217 is incorrect . 2. Unify the use of "soyabean" and "soybean" in the manuscript 3. The data in Table 1 and its subsequent figure "Change in Supply of Soybean in Nigeria" were partly repeated. The comment is use the data in table 1 to plot a double Y-axis figure, to replace current table 1 and subsequent figure. 4. Table 2 and its followed figure "Trend in Soybean Contribution to Total Agricultural GDP from 1960 to 2011" seemed use the same data, however, with different title. This should be adjust with a proper way.	Thanks for this observation. However, the corrections requested in the following lines have been effected please check the corrected version. I have removed the tables and left the figures 1 and 2 to avoid the repetition as noted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Several weaknesses in this paper. The manuscript is deprived of smooth flow. Use of English language in this paper is very poor rendering many of its parts ambiguous.	The paper has been corrected with simply and understandable grammer. However, time must be taken not to water down the technical issues of the paper, hence it is important to relate the grammer in some areas to technicalities required in the methodology.