



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24003
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC COST OF LETHAL YELLOWING DISEASE (LYD) ON COCONUT (Cocos nuciferaL.) YIELD IN LYD ENDEMIC AREA OF NIGERIA: A CASE STUDY OF NIGERIAN INSTITUTE FOR OIL PALM RESEARCH (NIFOR)
Type of the 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	Lines 22-23: Indicate significance of the coconut industry to the agricultural sector of the Nigerian economy, either in terms of gross annual yield (tonnes) or scope of cultivation (hectares). Line 77: When did LYD spread to Nigeria? Indicate the year and exact region of the country. Line 126: The study design statement is meaningless. The correct statement should read either: (i)..... degree of prevalence of LYD in coconut varieties in Nigeria, or (ii).... degree of susceptibility of various coconut varieties to LYD in Nigeria. Lines 267-271: Collapse into a single paragraph and recompose the statement. Consider the suggestion below: Having demonstrated (not considered) the economic cost of lethal yellowing disease on coconut yield, it is recommended that, campaign on how to prevent and control the incidence of LYD should be conducted regularly by extension workers to reduce the incidence of the disease in the zone.	These have been corrected accordingly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 38-40: Are you suggesting that the dwarf varieties are not cultivated commercially, even with their comparatively higher tolerance to LYD and resistance to windstorm damage? Line 44: In-vitro, instead of In vitro. Line 159: Would an increase in the explanatory variable, EAYDP increase economic cost, or rather economic gain? Or are the two terms synonymous in your econometric model? Reconsider. Line 226: dependent variable, Economic Cost (not dependent variables) Line 263: yield in the Nigerian Institute for Oil Palm Research. Line 266: has (not had) a devastating impact on coconut yield	The sentence has been removed since both varieties are actually cultivated for commercial purposes. Though, coconut growers prefer the tall varieties to the dwarf varieties because of the quality and quantity of copra they produce and the long lifespan. Corrected The two terms are not synonymous in econometric model. In this case since the expected annual yield was not realized, an increase in the variable will increase economic cost. Corrected Corrected Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion, unless required by AJEA, inclusion of the research hypotheses in the article is not necessary; it is assumed in the stated specific objectives. There should have been at least, one table showing annual coconut yield data for the stated	Was removed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	duration, 2000-2010, appropriately placed in an appendix. 3. Research reports (annual reports, technical papers, journal articles, etc) are often written in the simple past tense. The author used both simple past and simple present tense. Compare lines 135 and 138. 4. Though, I cannot vouch for the robustness of the statistical tool (Eviews), employed in the analysis, the descriptive statistics look good. The paper should, therefore, pass as good.	
--	---	--