



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37721
Title of the Manuscript:	Profitability and Viability Analysis of Aquaculture production in Central Uganda: Urban and Peri-Urban Areas
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The results of the socio-economic characteristics are entirely different from the results presented in the results. The discussion deviates from what the author(s) have in the manuscript. The costs and returns estimates result is unscientific because the author(s) measurement was based on average other than per unit area or per unit output (kg/quintal/ton).	Identified the technique(s) used in drawing the sample size from the sampling frame. Present the sampling frame showing the selected districts, sub-counties, sampling frame in each sub-counties and the sample size for each sub-counties. The sampling technique has been included in the methodology for both districts and sub counties and the sample size for the different sub-counties line 69-78. Results were calculated based on average production area of 1108m² of both Catfish and Tilapia enterprises The wording has been rephrased and all the calculations are based on unit production area and unit production costs as indicated in line 82 to 85 Net farm income formula had a mistake Net farm income formula was corrected as suggested by the reviewers' line 96 Benefit cost ratio is not meant for cross-sectional data both rather time series data Benefit cost ratio formula was deleted since it's meant for times series data and not cross sectional data and some equations The results of the socio-economic characteristics are entirely different from the results presented in the results. The discussion deviates from what the author(s) have in the manuscript. These results are not in tandem with the results presented in Table 1. Cross-check Socioeconomic characteristics results in the write up have been re-written to tally with the results presented in the table 1, and the results on district representation have been also added These results are not in tandem with the results presented in Table 2. Cross-check! The section on production characteristics have been re-written and the information tally with the results in the tables, results on seed sources have added to the table. And the information that is not part of the findings has been delete. The costs and returns estimates should be on per unit area or per unit of output and not the average taken since farmers endowment differs. Therefore, this result is unscientific. The results have been calculated per unit cost in relation to quantities utilized by the farmer's line 204



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Profitability analysis in table 4 was recalculated and benefit cost ratio results have been dropped since they are meant for time series data as suggested by the reviewer 227-228 This is not how to report research article. Report what are in your results and not story telling All the unnecessary information on the challenges has been deleted and only remained with the results The discussion deviates from what the author(s) have in the manuscript. The costs and returns estimates result is unscientific because the author(s) measurement was based on average other than per unit area or per unit output (kg/quintal/ton. The results that supposed to yield these discussion are faulty/unscientific All the results have been corrected (measured per unit area/kilo gram) and part of the discussion line 310 to 327 has been changed to suit the findings
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The work is not scientific	