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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Topic: The topic should have been "Farmers Perception of Fadama Project in Kwara State, Nigeria"** **This is because impact analysis has not been well captured by the study. Impact should be on incremental benefit (be it of annual income as proposed etc.) and this difference should be statistically tested for any significant or not before conclusion can be made. A Propensity Score Matching (PSM) whose aim of matching is to find the closest comparison group from a sample of nonparticipants to the sample of participants is good for impact study.** **Likewise for line 127-149, the socioeconomic characteristics should be separately discussed for Fadama and non-Fadama respondents.** **Line 188 should read table 5 and not table 4.**	Topic: Not agree to the suggested topic because the study was not on farmers' participation but on the impact of their participation. Student t-test was use to test for the significant difference in the annual income of both the participants and non-participants and there was a significant difference at 1% level of significance. There are many methods to measure impact and the reviewer should not impose his or her own method on the authors. Not agree because the respondents have common socio-economic characteristics. It was on this basis that impact of fadama farming can be measured among them. It is only their annual income that impact is measured and this was dichotomized and was discussed as such. Agreed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	-	