



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_5401
Title of the Manuscript:	POVERTY AND RISK ATTITUDES: THE CASE OF CASSAVA FARMERS IN AWUTU-SENYA DISTRICT OF THE CENTRAL REGION OF GHANA
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Line 24-26: The recommendation is not clear. Which aspect of the enabling environment and how would it help improve farmers' risk management skills? Line 31 -39: The relationship established between the statistics (share of agriculture in GDP 34%, agricultural GDP's growth 6%) and subsequent variables (low productivity, low input use, post-harvest losses, etc.) is not obvious, nor is it correct. It is also not clear for what Tipcee (2003) is referred to. Line 41-48: It is not clear what the vicious circle of poverty is. The formulations in this paragraph are quite confusing. It implies there is no way poor people can get out of poverty, which is not correct. The way the determinants of uncertainty are related to risk aversion and poverty are also not correct. I doubt Moscardi (2003) has said it that way. The vicious circle should be made clearer. Risk aversion should be defined clearly, and should be distinguished from the poor's presumed incapacity to make reliable prediction about the future. I do not agree with the latter assertion. Line 49-63: Why the choice of Awutu-Senya district? Why cassava farmers to study the relationship between farmers' attitudes towards risks and poverty? Which sorts of risks have previous studies documented (production risks – technological and	Addressed Re-written to address the comment Addressed Addressed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	climate changes; market risks – price instability, uncertainty of demand, etc.) in the study area and which one(s) are the focus of the present study? There is lack of consistency between research questions 2 and 3: risk behaviour vs. risk attitude. Use the same phrase in both questions. Question 2 seems to indicate a new quest of fact about risk attitude whereas the literature review seems to have emphasized already risk aversion as the prevalent risk attitude among the poor. The kind of risks and aspects of poverty being investigated in the present study should be highlighted before the relationship between risk attitude and poverty is checked in question 3. Line 67-68: Confusing Line 88-90: Confusion of methods with disciplines. For example, economic anthropology and econometrics are not methods; they are disciplines. The rest (iii – v) are methods. Line 112-114: Author should indicate which modifications he made to the ELCEPH in this study and why? Line 137-147: Indicate what level of risk aversion or likelihood of it can be anticipated from this kind of agro-ecological environment. Once again, indicate why cassava farmers to study the 'risk aversion – poverty' relationship. Line 185: A sign (- or +) seems to be missing in the bracket.	Addressed Addressed Addressed addressed addressed Have double checked to make sure it is correct
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 189-190: Not clear. How one single parameter can!m indicate/measure three different variables (head count ratio, poverty gap and squared poverty gap) at the same time? Rather say the value 0, 1 and 2 correspond to P becoming respectively the head count ratio, the poverty gap and the squared poverty gap. Line 193: What does an income unit correspond to and how is the poverty line defined? Line 305-324: Why repeat here the model which is already described in line 185-199? Line 355-356: The skewness is not sharply obvious if one compares “poor” and “non-poor”. In order to improve this, I suggest “very poor” and “poor” be merged as “poor” in table 3, and that Chi-2 test be run to confirm the significance of the relationship ‘risk attitude – poverty’. Line 369: “risk” simply or “risk attitude”? Table 4: The T-value is very high and positive for the variable “Sex” (6.082), meaning risk attitude (aversion?) is strongly related to (explained by) sex. How does this relate to poverty? Indeed, being poor strongly explains risk aversion (T-value =7.454), but is sex an underlying driver? This is worth highlighting in view of appropriate gender policies. The test for autocorrelation among explanatory variables should be performed (e.g. DW statistic) to indicate the extent to which interaction between poverty and other explanatory variables (e.g. sex)	Corrected Addressed Addressed Addressed but we could not run the suggested chi-2 test since what it is required to explain had been done using the regression result in table 4. Corrected We have re-run the regression result to double check and based on that to make necessary corrections in the table. We could not have run autocorrelation as suggested since such test was found to be more appropriate for time series data. We however, run correlation among the variables but found it not necessary to present in the paper since it outcome did not permit dropping any of the variables in
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	contributes to explain the strong overall F-value obtained; The regression equation should be then corrected for autocorrelation. Line 378-379: This conclusion is wrong. T-value below 2 means non-significance at 5% level. Age, household size and education level should not be included among the significant variables. On the contrary, sex should not be omitted. The policy implications have not been stated. All subsequent lines should be revisited, as well as the conclusions (line 443-445). Recommendations should be more specific and address clearly the critical/significant explanatory variables in the regression model	the model specified. No two explanatory variables were found to be highly correlated following Davies interpretations Corrected
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 118-135: Draw a figure to illustrate the conceptual framework. Variables that are naturally correlated in the farm decision-making process and outcomes should be clearly separated from the risk attitude indicator which is presumed to be explained poverty status and vice-versa Line 153-157: too long sentence Line 163-164: Check the definition of SPSS. Is it not Statistical Package for Social Sciences? Line 167: Cross-sectional and secondary data are not of comparable nature. You can say cross-sectional vs. time series, or primary vs. secondary. Line 200: "its" instead of "it" Line 247-249: 550 is annual or monthly income? And which "certain amount" are you talking about? How is that critical value selected? Line 253 -255: Confusing formulation. Indicate clearly what the dependent variable is, and what the explanatory variables are. Which one measures the risk attitude? Clarify this in line 262, if Pi is the one. Line 290-291: income is monthly or annual?	We would have wished to include a figure illustration but could not do so due to space limitation. Addressed Addressed Corrected Corrected Addressed Addressed Addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a good paper. The methodology was very interesting. However, the justification of the study should be well formulated in the introduction. The author should address well the compulsory comments and make better policy recommendations that stem directly from the study's findings.	Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--