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	Section 2.2 Lines 80-82: "According to research…" - Which research? (cite) Specifically, which demographic variables have been studied (line 81)? You have only cited research about SES and education level in this section. Since consumer perception of health risk is a major component of this paper, don't be afraid to cite work from this literature that may not specifically have to do with food safety but that will provide good understanding of the issues for this study and perhaps a theoretical basis for your work. Section 2.3. Is the "consumption phenomenon" a concept coined by another author? Who? This sounds like it could be a theory or conceptual framework to support your research. If that's the case, develop this a little more here (with proper citations) and then plan to come back to it in your discussion to demonstrate if your research upholds the theory or not (e.g., people appear influenced not only by price but by perceived safety when buying leafy vegetables, but the level of influence appears affected by various SES and demographic variables). 3. Methods – **I do most of my work using qualitative methods, so please check Methods section with someone with more expertise in quantitative research. Below are my thoughts but shouldn't be taken as the final word.** I found the organization of 3 and 4 somewhat confusing. Be sure Methods (site selection, sampling methods,	

	survey tools and their administration in that order) are separated from analysis (coding and statistics employed) which is separated from Results. - I suggest either describing the survey tool in detail (maybe include the survey itself if there's room?) or direct reader to table(s) that list questions so reader knows early on what exactly was asked. A copy of the survey would reduce description of types of questions (below). - For easier reading, I suggest moving sentences describing the types of close-ended questions in the survey forward before line 114. Analysis – have someone else look over the "perception index" to be sure this makes statistical sense. (The concept sounds good.) Line 122: Be careful using a word like "influence" as this may imply causality. "Association" might be a better term. RESULTS Line 135: "most consumers (22.5%)" 22.5% is not most. Perhaps it was the indicator that was identified most frequently by your survey respondents? Line 140/Figure 4.2 The label should read "Indicators of unsafe leafy vegetables <u>as perceived by consumer respondents</u>" or something to that effect. Lines 143-152: I cannot comment on the use of statistics. Line 150: you didn't actually include anything in the survey that stated health implications. There may be health implications because people may fear becoming sick from eating leafy vegetables, or they might avoid eating leafy vegetables because they fear sickness, thus decreasing intake of important micronutrients, but then put this under Discussion.	

	line 151: "leafy vegetables with chemical residue <u>are considered</u> very unsafe…" "…which can even cause death in extreme cases" – this wasn't part of the survey wording. If you want to speculate (with good reason) about consequences, put this in Discussion. 4.2 – Again, have someone more knowledgeable look this over. Are those p values in last column? I thought that a p value > .05 (could stretch to .074) is usually not considered significant? Line 233: change "influences" to "associated with" **REFERENCES** Author lists only one reference within last 5 years. Take another look at what's been done in the field more recently.	

Minor REVISION comments	1 Introduction Line 36: "definitely leave some residues in the crop. [These chemicals are associated with…(diseases).]" citation Line 46: describe what you mean by "carelessly handled" and how this increases consumers' health risk (and cite reference) 2.1 Some specific examples or actual statistics about safety of fresh leafy vegetables, especially in Ghana, could make paper more compelling. METHODS - Any criteria for selecting respondents other than age? Would day of the week or time of day matter? Were these people in the process of buying leafy vegetables or did this matter? (Just some things to consider.) Refer reader to Table 4.2 for a list of demographic characteristics that were included. - Were data gathered by oral interviews rather than a written survey? (otherwise, literacy an issue – you most likely would have screened for this) - I suggest using the term "convenience" sampling rather than "accidental sampling", but that's between you and the editors. RESULTS Line 132: Figure 4.1 isn't needed. Line 156L Table 4.1: "[Fresh?]Leafy vegetables in Ghana are generally not safe [to purchase in retail markets?]. Don't change if what is written is the actual question asked. 4.3 Line 185: How do you account that 3/4ths of respondents were confident in purchasing leafy vegetables when so many also agree that leafy vegetables	

	in retail markets are produced with excessive chemicals? (Maybe people wash them at home?) – can go in Discussion. Line 195: respondents were asked to assess… Line 228: change "awareness" to "consumer perception".	
Optional/General comments	The topic of research is both interesting and has practical implications. I hope the author continues to polish the paper and gets it published. Some grammar and syntax need to be cleaned up; I assume the editors will work with author on this. Example: Lines 26-27. Are you saying that about 90% of fresh perishable vegetables supplied are from urban and peri-urban production systems? What geographic area does this statistic refer to? (The readership is international.)	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer