

Review of: "Growth, Instability and Trend Analysis of Rice Production Indicators in Nigeria"

Naomi Kumi¹

¹ University of Energy and Natural Resources

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The research looked at the trends and decomposition of milled rice production indicators in Nigeria. The topic is quite interesting and important, but I think a little effort could be done by the authors. Below are some suggestions that could be addressed to improve the work.

1. The **abstract** must be a single paragraph and continuous. There is no need to separate them in to purpose, method, etc at the authors have done.
2. If it is not a recommended style of this journal, then it is better to merge the **introduction and Literature review**. As it stands now, the manuscript looks more like a thesis/dissertation format. For manuscript, the authors can reduce the literature review and include the salient ones that are more relevant to their work.
3. The study relied on only FAOSTAT **data** on rice output, yield, and cultivated area in the country. It would have helped a lot if the authors had cited any previous study conducted in Nigeria, that have evaluated the FAOSTAT data to confirm that there is a good correlation between this data and the data from the Food and Agricultural Organization in Nigeria. Under Section 3.2.2. (Instability in rice Production), I do not understand what the authors were doing there. Were they writing notes or reviewing literature or what? Because what they have written there is not "methodology". I suggest that they clearly write down their methodology.
4. In the **Results and Discussion** section, the authors did not compare their findings with any existing study. Moreover, they were just reporting their results; not proper discussion was done. In Figure 1, what is the unit of the values on the y-axis? Again, the authors should look for a way to reduce the zeros on the y-axis. For instance, 200000,00 could be written as 200, then you write the unit in Kilogram (to absorb the remaining 000). Also, one can hardly see the charts for the Yield (in green colour). This is because the authors are trying to use the same scale for different parameters; some could be large while other are small. This is my suggestion: the authors could plot the four parameters separately but in panels; a 2x2 matrix. Panel (a) could production, (b) Rice Paddy, (c) Area and (d) Yield. This will give room for each of the plots to be seen clearly and have different scales but still be a single figure. The comments and suggestions in Figure 1 apply to Figure 2 as well.
5. In the **Conclusion**, how do the authors mean by "... rice performs substantially better in Nigeria"? I believe that a concise conclusion should be written after the authors rewrite their results and discussion section.
6. I suggest that the authors should carve their **recommendations** from their study, not just making a general suggestion to government.
7. I do not see much cited articles in the manuscript but there seem to be many **references**. The authors must cross

check that all referenced articles are duly cited in the write-up.