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		

Line	Review comments
35	Previous agricultural programmes
58	Traditional *irrigation* techniques adopted by the project
67-73	can't see the need to define irrigation here
74	delete therefore
78	Delete however
80	Government adopter in 2001 *change to* in 2001 government adopted
80	Fadama development Project II (Fadama II)
99	Provide reference
117	*You mean*Fadama Community Association(FCA)
116	Insert (LGA) after local government area
127-148	Over use of the word "this implies"
158	Remove other benefits…….
	Remove title
182	*Change* participate to do
188	Consider… table 4 below reveal

Line	Authors' comments
35	agree
58	agree
67-73	It is necessary to justify fadama project
74	Agree
78	agree
80	Not agree because the sentence does not flow well
99	agree
117	No community where fadama activities are taking place
116	Agree
127-148	Agree
158	Agree
182	Agree
188	Agree

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		