SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJAEES_15814**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Factors Influencing the Participation of Crop Farming Households in Non-Farm Activities in Ghana**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Literature Review** **2.3 Determinants of non-farm participation** The author just review only one article that is related to this research. This is unbelievable! The author should review more empirical research and add to this sections. **4.1 Demographic characteristics of Households** Line 178-179, "*This means that the males who are more involved in farming activities are now engaging in non-farm activities"*. This statement is false. Because 78.7% of the households are headed by males does not mean that this is what is making the male headed household to leave farming. There is no fact to support this sentence. The author should completely remove this or give it a different interpretation based on table 2 results. Line 182-183, *"From the table, 75% of the household heads which represent the majority of the working force are now engaging in non-farm activities"*. This is another wrong statement. Section 4.1, should be rewritten and discussion should be based on the result presented in table 2. Line 201: *"Households headed by the young (the youth) …"* This variable was not included in the model. How come it is being discussed?	We agree with the reviewer. More literature have been reviewed on this determinants of non-farm participation (see manuscript) The sentence has been modified. The sentence has been modified. It is clear from the binary logit regression results (see table 3) that the marginal effect for age is -0.0038562 and it significant at 1%. The negative sign implies that households headed by the younger people have higher probability of participating in non-farm activities than households headed by relatively elderly

	The discussion of the logit result especially, the dummy variables are appropriate. Example, in Line 211, *"This indicates that female headed households had the greater…."* According to how the author captures this dummy variable in table 1, the interpretation should be written in favour of the male headed households not female. The author should correct this statement for all dummy variables discussed in the paper.	people. This is correct interpretation contrary to what the reviewer thinks. Meanwhile, the sentence has been modified for clear understanding. We (authors) do not agree with the reviewer. In table 1, the researchers coded 1 for male headed households and 0 for female headed households. As such, when the marginal effect of sex is negative, then the effect is in favour of female headed households. Therefore, the interpretation is supposed to be that, "female headed households have the higher probability of participating in non-farm activities than male headed households". Alternatively, it can be interpreted as "male headed households have the lower probability of participation in non-farm activities than female headed households". All the other dummy variables are correctly interpreted contrary to reviewers assertion.
	Line 228: …. Of them simply ~~shine~~ (shy) away from farming activities ~~but rather~~. The author should effect this correction in the paper. Line 229: Marital (status) of household. Insert the word "status" in this line. **Conclusion** Line 247: … households whose heads had (more years of) formal education. Line 251-257: the recommendations are not based on the findings of this research. The author should write or give	The correction has been effected (see manuscript) The correction has been effected (see manuscript) The correction has been effected (see manuscript)

SDI Review Form 1.6

	recommendation based on the findings of this research.	Corrections have been effected (see manuscript)
Minor REVISION comments	**Abstract** The line which says… 'live in rural areas and live in savannah areas should' **should** be written as 'lived in rural and savannah areas….'	Corrections have been effected (see manuscript)
Optional/General comments		