



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_11997
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF MICRO AND SMALL SCALE AGRIBUSINESSES IN NORTHERN GHANA: NON-FINANCIAL ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	1. Methodology not explained in detail. It did not describe the sample size and sampling technique in the text eventhough its mentioned in the abstract 2. If the sample size is 200 why is it that all the frequency totals on the entire table could not tally but having different figures? It should be re-worked out 3. There is neither column for recommendation nor implication for the study. It is important. 4. The hypotheses are not statistically put. Null hypothesis should start with 'there is no significant difference between and variable and could either be accepted or rejected at certain alpha value 5. Kendall's concordance adopted for data analysis is not a popular statistical technique 6. References are not well-cited and examples are given. Moreover, most of the authors cited are stale say 1990s . advise to look for current studies on the research problem	You are right. That has been addressed I just realized it. That was the original sample size but was later reduced to 160. That has been done That has been restated This is a common statistical technique used. I do not agree with the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The abstract should be re-constructed to reflect the	This has been done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	following:- i. Statement of the research problem ii. The objectives of the study in one or two sentences iii. The methodology – sources of data, method of data collection, sample size and sampling technique; methods of data analysis; major findings; recommendations and conclusion iv. The title is too broad. It should be narrowed down by creating a subsection to describe the study area or under scope of study to delimit area covered by the study	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is not publishable in its present form. The author has to do serious work particularly on the data analysis, recommendation and up-dating the stale and moribund references	The stale references is as a result of the little work done in this area. Difficult to find current studies on this subject.