



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Lines 7-8 (7-8): The author should specify that the objective of the paper is twofold: to determine if socio-demographic characteristics affect consumers' perception of food safety, and to determine if there is a relationship between the perception of food safety and the decision to purchase. This should also be mentioned in the introduction (currently you did not put the objectives there), approximately at 2:52 52. Some references about previous studies on health concerns on leafy vegetables should be mentioned here. Possibly, regarding to Ghana. If nothing is available, then the author can emphasize that the paper is relevant. 73. The author should put the reference of the study, since it is related to the same topic. In addition, you could also describe the methodology and the results. 91. Put some references on previous works on variables other than price affecting the purchasing decision (possibly of food products) 105. The author should describe the questionnaire structure, and the variables/questions needed to collect data on socio-demographic characteristics, perception on safety, and intention to purchase 156-157; 175-176; 217-218; 221-222; 223-224. Have you cerified that no basic assumptions needed for the application of the Chi square are violated? It seems to me that Chi square requires at least 5 counts in cross tables. Since in several cases you have less than 5 respondents, you should merge some row or columns, in order to	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	comply with this requirement. 234-237. These implications are not derived by the study. Certainly, it is common sense that producers should use less pesticides and clean water, or that retailers pay more attention to handling of vegetables. Instead, you could mention here that the results prove that there are some premises to introduce or reinforce vegetables with low use of pesticides or organic produce. In addition, the study proves that some people are more concerned on safety issues than others. Is there a possible way to reassure these people through some sort of national certification schemes? Some specific communication or educational strategies could also be targeted at these people.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	11; 15; 19. Too many “also”. Please, revise 38. Please, correct “farmers have” 73. Please, change “One other” into “Another” 86. Please, add the year of the reference (1996) 97. Please, modify “arbitrary because”, in “arbitrary, but it is still relevant in that” 99. Please, change the citation style into “Yiridoe et al. (2005)” 123. Please, correct “tabulated against” 164. It seems that you add an extra “10%”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is very interesting, since it address a crucial issue regarding the consumers’ attitude to purchase leafy vegetables and the health concerns. It is a descriptive analysis, and probably the number of observations is sufficient also to challenge some econometric model (e.g. some logit model). The author should consider this possibility for another paper, being aware that there is a high possibility of incurring into an endogeneity problem, when you consider the influence of socio-demographic characteristics, the health concerns, and the decisions to purchase.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maurizio PROSPERI
Department, University & Country	Dept. SAFE, University of Foggia, Italy