



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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
New Title of the Manuscript:	Profitability and Viability Analysis of Aquaculture production in Central Uganda: A case of Urban and Peri-Urban Areas
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The author need to estimate the profitability on the basis of unit output or area of production. The manuscript required some revision. See comments in the manuscript. <u>THIS RESULT IS NOT EMPIRICAL AS THE RESOURCE ENDOWMENTS OF THE RESPONDENTS VARY. THE PROFITABILITY HAS TO BE CALCULATED ON THE BASIS OF PER UNIT OUTPUT OR AREA OF PRODUCTION FOR EACH OF THE SPECIES. FOR THE POOLED RESULT YOU SHOULD USE WEIGHTED AVERAGE AND NOT SIMPLE AVERAGE</u> The results are not scientific as such the discussion given above is null and void	The comments suggested in the abstract Comments made on the introduction have been accepted Minor corrections made on the methods has been accepted Poor linked to the running text-this sentence was deleted Payback period equation has been deleted since it can be used when dealing with time series data Profitability-This result is not empirical as the resource endowments of the respondents vary. The profitability has been calculated on the based on the per unit output for both catfish and tilapia enterprises using per unit marginal contribution Results in the profitability table are calculated based on one pond of average production area 1108m² of the individual farms considered under this study. It should be noted that currently we don't have a standardized measure like Mu like in china to base on our calculations. Farmers have varying pond sizes which are measured in meters squared that is why we considered average production area of the 15 fish farmers considered for profitability analysis. The discussion in is section has been rewritten based on the results calculated in table 3 and changes have been modified as suggested by the reviewer in the whole manuscript.

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold