

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_105696
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Preference Responses to Fertilizer Expenditures: A Case of Maize Smallholder Farmers in Iringa and Arusha Regions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is essential for the scientific community as it reveals Nigerian households' usage and risk preferences of inorganic fertilizers in two regions in Tanzania.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable. I suggest including Tanzania at the end of the Iringa and Arusha Regions.</p> <p>The abstract content is comprehensive. It contains the relevant points (objective, description of the data and method, detailed results, and recommendations).</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the content of the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are updated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality is suitable. However, in the revised version of the manuscript are included some suggestions.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is a relevant contribution to the scientific literature. The proposed quantitative method is suitable for testing the hypotheses about the usage and risk preferences of households producing maize in the investigated regions in Tanzania. I suggest verifying if some other goodness of fit of the tobit model can be included to complement the current ones. After the authors have included the reviewers' suggestions, allowing them to publish the manuscript is recommended.</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roselia Servin Juárez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Colegio de Postgraduados, Mexico</b>