



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13718
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF FADAMA PROJECT ON AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KWARA STATE, 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	This paper is written more as a report of the FADAMA project than a scientific paper. The paper should be re-organized and re-written as a scientific paper The statistical methodology and outcomes do not provide evidence for the conclusions and recommendations: only sex and type of agricultural activities are significantly related to productivity, the r values are very low and so, the reliability of the statistical results is under discussion The authors do not give any information or reference for the parameters under study References should be added for each statement, the paper should not present personal views, but the scientific results and data from the literature The manuscript needs linguistic revision Tables should be re-organized to summarize only significant results and values (not all of the percentages included in the text need to be presented in tables)	Not agreed. The paper assess impact of fadama project and I don't know how else I can report my findings Not agree. I have to report my findings and not what I did not see. Maybe the reviewer wants me to report what I did not see which I cannot do Not agree Not agree Not agreed. There is nothing wrong with providing enough information on the variables included in the study and the analysis while showing the ones that are significant among them. This is not linguistic it is a research report and they are not the same
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	competing interest:- Yes, there are: the authors recommend the project should not be determined according to the policy...[paragraph starting in line 222]	Not agreed. The reviewer did not understand authors' statement in line 222. It was recommended that fadama project should not be terminated after the phase of 5 years as the policy stated and not be determined as the reviewer stated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		