



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors strived to properly address most of the corrections required. But there is still a few improvement to be done: New lines 69-75: "While the government and the private sector have initiated". This sentence is too long. Break it into at least 3 sentences: 1- till "production environment of the farmer", 2- from "poverty and risk have been identified as key factors" till "desired outcome", 3- From: "Thus the need of this study ..." New lines 130-133: Sentence is too long. Table 4 (new table 3): a- Title should be changed to: Effects of poverty and other relevant household characteristics on risk attitude; b- I'm still concerned why the values 'very poor', 'poor' and 'non poor' of the variable 'poverty' are considered as separate variables! One respondent cannot give more than one value, right? Did it happen that more than one respondent were interviewed in a same household? Even then! c- The high significance observed for that key variable might have been due to multicollinearity (not autocorrelation as I wrongly said before) stemming from taking the single variable (poverty) as three. The variable Fip is at stake. How did it turn into three variables? I like the paper and have no bad intention towards the authors. I just wish this critical part of the paper is clarified and written better. New lines 454-456: Findings of Moscardi and de Janvry (1977) and Binswanger (1980) are not confirmed by this study. Why so then? It is necessary to explain. I think formal/western education (attending classic schools) is not very relevant when trying to explain smallholder farmers' behaviour regarding resource use decision-making (attitude towards risk) in West Africa. We should think of new methods of measuring the "education" variable in such specific contexts. Elsewhere, exposure to indigenous knowledge about farming (using a few reference indicators) is proposed to replace level/number of years of formal/western education.	Addressed in line 67 to 74 on page 2 Addressed in line 127 to 132 on page 3 Addressed in line 398 With regards to the poverty variable, we grouped farmers based on their income category compared to the national poverty line. That enabled us to be able to group the farmers and entered the different poverty categories into the regression model. We had to limit the groupings to poor and non-poor by following earlier suggestion to merge very poor and poor into one category as 'poor'. we understand the other way we could handle the variable would be to make it a dummy variable (with D=1 if farmer was classified as poor; D=0 if farmer was classified as non poor) but we preferred using the categories as another option available to us. 'Addressed in line 410 to 416'. Addressed in line 457 to 464