



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_5789
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumers' Perception of Safety of Leafy Vegetables and Its Effect on Their Vegetable Purchasing Decisions in the Kumasi Metropolis of Ghana
Type of the Article	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 paper is well structured. -The article language is good enough. However, there is few mistakes as example : Page 5, line 123. Write" tabulated against" instead of "tabulatedagainst" -Page 5, line 134 and 135. Kindly make extra line space between line 134 and 135. Page 7, Table 4.1. It seems that it has been calculated in wrong way. Kindly re-check the data entering carefully. Write "2.71" instead of "2.53" Write 2.03" instead of '2.52" Write "1.18" instead of 1.22" Do not forget to change the relevant numbers in the text (Page 6). The total number of answer should be 200. I found in the second row that $35+75+44+37+8=199$ And in the fifth row that $162+35+1+1+1=197$. Could you please explain how the total number of responses was not fixed (200)? Page 7, line 163-165. "Level of formal education (years), occupation, monthly income were significant with perception of unsafe leafy vegetable at 10%, 10%, 1% and 1%	Concern noted and addressed. Concern noted and addressed. I have had a second look at this and the original figures except the first one are correct. $\frac{(35 \times 1) + (75 \times 2) + (44 \times 3) + (37 \times 4) + (9 \times 4)}{200}$ $= 2.55$ Using the same approach will give you 1.55, 2.52 and 1.22 This has been corrected. The 8 was supposed to be 9. There is nothing wrong with this please. $162+35+1+1+1 = 200$ This has been re-written.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	respectively". I think there is a parameter missing. In this statement there are three parameters (Level of formal education, occupation, monthly income) related to four numbers (10%, 10%, 1% and 1%) Page 8. Table 4.2. There is a big problem in this table.in this study the number of the selected consumers is 200. However, I found that the total number of responses (the summation of number of answers (SA, A, N, D, SD) was from 178 to 210. From my point of view, it is impossible to have total responses number on the same question more than the total number of the selected consumers (200). Again, it seems there is something wrong happened during your data entering. Page 10, figure 4.4. When you say 4 or more times per month that is mean or equivalent to once per week and 2-3 times or 4 or more times per week. Therefore, I am just wounding how it can be 7% (4 or more per month) while it is 22.5% (once per week). From my point of view, the parameter (4 or more times per month) represents an overlapping with the rest of parameter in the figure. How can solve this point? This fault goes back to the question	I perfectly agree with you. Yes, something wrong happened during the data entry. However, it was post-analysis entry (when the table was being constructed for the manuscript. The output of the analysis was perfect. The problem occurred during the transfer of data from the SPSS output to MS Word-based table. But the correction has been effected after comparing the original output with the table 4.2 (now 3.2). The other figures remain the same. I totally agree with you. The possibility of merging some of the categories was there but that might not represent a true reflection of what respondents would have gone for. We have therefore agreed to take out the table.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	choices in the questionnaire. If could not solve it. Just remove this figure	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		