

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 11/29/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 11/30/2016
Manuscript Title: MODELING FERTILIZER DEMAND AMONG COTTON GROWERS IN BENIN: DOES PRICE MATTER IN A CENTRALIZED DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1261/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The author needs to make clear if title concerns cotton growers, cotton farmers or cotton growing villages	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The author needs to put clearly that he regression model deals with village level fertilizer demand.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Judgment instead of judgement, for instance</i> "is the highest" instead of "is highest" "depends on farmer' socio-economic conditions" instead of "depends on the farmer's socio-economic conditions"	

<p>"it is also worth investigating the influence" or "it is also worth to investigate the influence" instead of "it is also worth investigate the influence"</p> <p>"the consumer will rank his preferences accordingly" instead of "the consumer will rank his or preferences accordingly".</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>It is still worth recalling the microeconomic theory that links prices to the demand of a good. Then, the author should let the reader know why he makes use of certain variables and not of others. That is a baseline in econometrics.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p><i>There is a need to put forward explanation on the institutional environment that governs over the fertilizer pricing system, for instance explain clearly the structure of the fertilizer price or give full insights on the institutional arrangement between fertilizer traders and farmers' village cooperatives, and not use this explanation as a result afterward.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p><i>The conclusion is perfect if care is taken off the reorganization of ideas stated earlier at point 5.</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p><i>There is a need to add certain references and leave out others.</i></p> <p>Dedehouanou, H. 2003 Resisting reforms: a resource-based perspective of collective action in the distribution of agricultural input and primary health services in the Couffo region, Bénin in <i>Research Report 68/2003</i>, African Studies Centre; Leiden; The Netherlands.</p> <p>Dedehouanou, H. and P. Quarles van Ufford 2000 Comparing liberalisation in agricultural input and draught animal markets in Benin in Aad van Tilburg; HENK A.J. Moll and Arie Kuyvenhoven (eds); <i>Agricultural Markets Beyond Liberalization</i>; Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston/ Dordrecht/ London; pp. 173-189.</p> <p>Dèdèhouanou, H. 2000 Agricultural technology transfer under transaction costs: a Benin's case study in Alphonso Ogbuehi and Gabriel Ogunmokun (eds), 2000 Proceedings, The global challenge of African business and economic development in the New Millenium, International conference, April 11-14, 2000; Atlantic City, New Jersey - USA; pp. 235-241.</p> <p>Dedehouanou, H. 1999 Coalition-building for agriculture development: diseconomy of liberalization in Luiz Montanheiro, Bob Haigh, David Morris and Margaret Linehan (eds) <i>Public and Private Sector Partnerships: Furthering Development</i>; Sheffield Halam University Press, Sheffield; pp. 139-157.</p>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author should be very aware of the complex context of the liberalization process in the fertilizer sector in Benin. As the author could easily observe, the government fully controlled the agricultural input sector the last five years. So, it is not "state planning" vs "market". For instance, from 1992 to 1999 there was a gradual and step by step liberalization in the fertilizer sector; this is to say that government still intervened where the private was absent. But, at the same time after delivery service to farmers declined to zero because most extension officers were sent off as a result of the structural adjustment program. From 2000 up to 2011, the private sector (traders) in charge of fertilizer supply found out the need to supplement extension services to cotton farmers through the existing government structure.

At the same time, from 1992 to 1999 and 2000 up to 2011, the village level is totally administered by farmers' cooperatives, duty that was completely achieved by the former extension officers lastly fired . This is to say that a full-fledged context is necessary and not the reverse. The context should not appear as a finding, rather the ways in which this difficult context should be mitigated and pathways to performance set as perspectives.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I strongly acknowledge the publication of the concerned paper as soon as the author proceeds to the minor revisions.

