



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_45892
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Price insurance programs on supply response: a case study of corn farmers in Quebec
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>)

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	This is quite a good paper which needs only a few amendments. First, the text that now appears as footnotes should be incorporated into the main body of the text. Footnotes should not be used in academic papers apart from specific exceptions. Second, the section of the literature review which simply lists previous studies and their results should either be rewritten to provide a purpose for these studies to have been included in the paper or else deleted. The conclusion should incorporate the research limitations and the suggestions for future research. The list of references should be checked to see if some do not appear in the text in the form of in-line citations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All footnotes were incorporated into the main body of the text and were highlighted in yellow. lines 48 and 49 indicates that "Several theoretical and empirical studies have focused on analyzing the effect of price volatility on farmers' production decisions". Thus the objective of all literature mentioned in the paper is to analyze the supply response to price risk. However, I explained it for each study. The modifications were highlighted in green. There is no limitation for this study. Some suggestion for future research were provided and highlighted in green. The reference list has been checked
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	NA