



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJRAF_43304
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF FARM RISK AND COPING STRATEGIES AMONG MAIZE FARMERS IN LERE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	FULL LENGTH RESEARCH PAPER

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	Some modifications and additions need to be done in order to make the paper more concrete and scientific. First and foremost, the scholarship/literature consulted at the level of introduction was too narrow. More scholarship/literature should have been consulted in order to give the study a stronger foundation on which to build on. Therefore, something should be done in this light before the paper is published. At the level of materials and methods, the map of the study area should be inserted if possible in order to make the reader easily visualize the area under study. Equally, the type of logistic regression model used should be well stated. We have the Binary or Binomial Logistic Regression model and the Multinomial Logistic Regression model. In this study, one of these models has been used. You should state in clear terms the logistic regression model used, the reasons for using the model and if possible the assumptions or rules governing the use of this model. Moreover, the Statistical software used for data analysis should be clearly stated. The results of the study have been well presented. They were presented following the specific objectives of the study, which makes the work very coherent. Kudos for that. However, the discussion of the results was too superficial. It must be said that the results were merely described and not discussed. The researcher(s) should have compared and contrasted the results with those of other authors in order to make the discussion more concrete. Only one author (Issa et al., 2016) was used in the discussion section, which is too superficial. An in-depth discussion should therefore be done by comparing the results found in this study with those of other authors. Further more, at the level of the regression results, the researcher(s) laid emphasis only on the factors (variables) that had a positive and significant relationship with adoption of risk coping strategies which makes it too exclusive. A comprehensive explanation of all the factors should be undertaken in order to make the reader of the paper better understand the overall scenario occurring in the study area. Last but not the least, only seven (07) references were consulted for this study which is too shallow. This stems from the fact that very few scholarship/literature was consulted at the level of introduction. More literature therefore needs to be consulted in order to make the study in-depth and ready for publication.	1. The type of manuscript is "Original research paper" 2. More literature added to provide in-depth background knowledge of the study as instructed by the reviewer. The whole introduction has been restructured with more scholarship/literature consulted thereby giving the study a stronger foundation. 3. The map of Lere Local Government Area is inserted as suggested. 4. Binary logistic regression model which is the type of logistic regression used is now stated. The reason for using the binary logistic is also stated as requested by the reviewer. The statistical software used is the SPSS. 5. The discussion of result revisited to convey better and concrete meaning. Results from other studies were also used as basis for comparison with the findings of this study. 6. The discussion of the regression results focused only on the statistically significant variables so as to reduce ambiguity of the discussion. This is a usual practice in many researches consulted. 7. More Literature consulted bringing the references to a reasonable number. 8. All major and minor corrections effected as requested by the reviewer. Note: The author appreciates the thorough work done by the reviewer as all the issues raised were factual. The areas revisited by the author in the manuscript are highlighted in green for easy identification. The yellow colour instructed is not visibly clear. Thank you.
Minor REVISION comments	Put the abbreviation LGA in bracket before using it. Like this "Local Government Area (LGA)".	Correction effected
Optional/General comments		