



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42141
Title of the Manuscript:	Do Flood Hazards affect Risk Attitudes? An Experimental Analysis in Agriculture-dependent Communities in Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original 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	The Introductory part of this work needs formatting as it gives too general information about risks and uncertainties. This should be look at and narrowed down to issues pertaining to Agriculture in the study area. The Methodology aspect didn't talk about the sampling design used in getting the communities and how the respondents were selected. Was is largely based on purposive sampling? If so, what measures were taken to reduce individual baises of respondents I don't see how Gambling experience of respondents for instance, directly links with flood risk issues under this study. Kindly look at this again and let all variables measured correspond directly to achieving the main objective of the paper. I have concerns about why Gambling is used as a safety net for flood victims. New schemes are been employed to educate farmers like giving them timely early warning climate information, etc.	Comment: The introduction has been revised to focus on specific agricultural challenges in Cameroon Comment: Modified and additional information provided in the Methodology section. Only communities which witnessed floods less than 5 years were purposively selected in order to reduce recall-related biases. Victims' selection was purposive, while nonvictims were randomly selected from same communities for comparison. Comment: Gambling is an indicator for risk taking. This has been previously proven in previous research on agriculture-dependent populations (see for instance Balgah and Buchenrieder (2011) for Cameroon (reference no. 7); and Binswanger (1980) (reference no.11) for India Comment: The reviewer is partly right about the existence of new options towards developing safety nets for farmers. Nevertheless, gambling is used here not as a safety net, but as a means to estimate the capacity of the sample population to eventually engage in risk taking-high-return technologies such as the adoption of new varieties and farming technologies
Minor REVISION comments		To the extent possible, all the suggested comments have been addressed.
Optional/General comments		The author is extremely grateful to the reviewer for the insightful comments



SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6