



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9960
Title of the Manuscript:	COINTEGRATION AND MARKET INTEGRATION: AN APPLICATION TO HIDES AND 'POMO' MARKETS IN NIGERIA
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	All the write should be amended and the necessary data is not there and the available table are not explained well	M1. The two markets can represent Nigeria because Kano market is the central market where hides are collected before distributed to other states. Also, over 85% of the tanneries in Nigeria are found in Kano State. Lagos State was expected to have the largest market for the sales of 'pomo'. Therefore, these two markets can represent Nigeria.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		M2. Under abstract, the format of abstract for AJEA is what I followed, I know this is not the general format but it is the AJEA format I followed. M3. On my introduction, all the references are provided and the documents are available as evidences. M4 has been corrected, some other corrections have been effected. M5. There is the need for literature in this type of research work to see what other people have done related to the work. That was why I included the literature. M6 – M10 have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	ethical issues : Yes data are not well taken may be ... it is not real information some of them at all	