



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper would be strengthened with a thorough edit. This will result in a more academic and professional presentation of these findings. 2. Facts that are not supported by research presented need to supported with references. For example, if the author(s) state something like "advanced economies have recognized the importance of" or "There is a strong correlation between..." the sources of these claims need to be included. 3. Highly suggest the detailed listing of revisions in the section below be considered and the paper revised accordingly. 4. These findings need to be contextualizing within the broader literature in a concluding section. Do the findings differ from the expectations? From other literature? How and why? 	All the concerns of the reviewer have been taken care of.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>I have included a detailed list of suggested, which I hope will help strengthen the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 25: Which challenges, be explicit. 2. Line 27: Too broad of a generalization, not all. 3. Line 31: "[4] described" change to the author's name and put the reference at the end of the sentence. 4. Line 34: Why? 5. Line 36/37: Provide evidence, statistics. 6. Line 44/45: Too broad. It is a viable livelihood in some developing countries. Be specific. 7. Line 47: change "etc" to "other stakeholders. 8. Line 54: This study is also time and place specific. 9. Line 62: See point 3 above. 	<p>All the concerns of the reviewer have been taken care of.</p> <p>The authors referencing style is strictly based on the requirements of the journal.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>10. Line 65: %?</p> <p>11. Line 66: Size?</p> <p>12. Line 68: hole or hoe?</p> <p>13. Line 70: Are these available data on current production levels? These can be compared with other levels to demonstrate their lower levels.</p> <p>14. Line 81: List some examples of these arguments and the sources. This is directly relevant to your study. Your conclusions should reflect your findings within these debates.</p> <p>15. Line 84: See point 3 above.</p> <p>16. Line 88: See point 3 above.</p> <p>17. Line 111: See point 3 above.</p> <p>18. Section 2.3: Suggest you include assessing other studies as well. Such others you have cited, or:</p> <p>Headey, D., A. S. Taffesse and L. You. 2014. Diversification and development in pastoralist Ethiopia. <i>World Development</i> 56: 200-213.</p> <p>Gecho, Y., Ayele, G., Lemma, T. and Alemu, D. 2014. Rural Household Livelihood Strategies: Options and Determinants in the Case of Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia. <i>Social Sciences</i> 3(3): 92-104.</p> <p>Tsegaye, D., Vedeld, P. and Moe, S. R. 2013. Pastoralists and Livelihoods: A Case Study from Northern Afar, Ethiopia. <i>Journal of Arid Environments</i> 91: 138-146.</p> <p>19. Line 127-129: Is this the only reason? Certainly there are other potential reasons one might engage in non-farm activities. Government pressure to participate in a certain activity might be an example where the individual feels s/he has little choice in participation, and participation without personal gain (although the utility might socio-political, but not economic). There are many similar examples.</p> <p>20. Section 3.3 and 3.4 should appear earlier in the paper.</p> <p>21. Line 159: This appears to contradict what was stated in line 64.</p> <p>22. Lines 190-192: Are these sums significant? The paper is arguing non-farm activities are essential for poverty reduction. These figures seem to imply improving agricultural productivity might have a greater financial impact.</p>	<p>Most of the things the reviewer wants the authors to revised are minor and irrelevant. On the other hand, all the relevant concerns have been addressed (see manuscript).</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>23. Line 204-205: Or that they have different skills. 24. Line 228: "shine" or "shy" 25. Line 228-229: Incomplete sentence. 26. Line 253: Should jobs be provided by the government and non-government bodies, or should they facilitate the development of the private sector?</p> <p>This is largely unknown from the paper. Was the research approved by an ethics review?</p>	<p>Most of the things the reviewer wants the authors to revised are minor and irrelevant. On the other hand, all the relevant concerns have been addressed (see manuscript).</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		