



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I do not understand why the authors do not adhere to even the most basic form requirements. The style of the paper would not be sufficient for even a bachelor thesis at our institution. The paper used black text, red text (!?), blue text. There is a line through the middle of the text. The text is partly incomprehensible; the English deserves professional editing services. A few substantive points: 1) the discussion of risk methods is confused and confusing. 2) the poverty measure is population based and derives from individual poverty measures (that are not carefully discussed). It is not clear to me how the individual measures could therefore derive at the same time from the population measure. But maybe this is not what the authors did, and the wrting is just confusing. 3) line 224: should be $U^2(W)=0$ i suppose 4) line 228ff: utility under risk is *cardinal* 5) what are ethically neutral probabilities? 6)line 257ff: Logit? I understand that the authors have a continuous CE measure. This asks for tobit or regression. Why tobit. What are the binary measures here?	We are sorry to note that there was a miss-up at the time of uploading the manuscript which resulted in sending a processed version instead of the final version intended for submission. We however, take full responsibility for the content of the paper we submitted. Have taken note of the comments and have addressed them accordingly as much as possible Clarified in the revised text Addressed Corrected Our source was from the literature but we have recast the sentence to do away with such conflict in the write-up. Like $p=0.5$, such probabilities give equal chances of all possible outcomes in lotteries. Explained in the text. The dependent variable (farmer risk attitudes) was captured as a dummy (1= if



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7) sample size 50 is too small for correlational study. *) we would typically order the tables from risk aversion to neutrality in the middle (!) to risk seeking! 8) table 4: effect on risk? Why on risk? On risk aversion? Or seeking? If poor, nonpoor, and very poor are included, what is the excluded category?	a farmer is risk averse, 0= otherwise) Addressed Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		