



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 Factors Influencing 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	<p>(a) All sentences in the first paragraph of the introduction were authoritative and need to be backed by literature citation(s);</p> <p>(b) The sentence starting with 'Considering' in line 25 and ending with the word 'deceasing' in line 27 is hanging. Moreover, the problems highlighted are macroeconomic issues that need to be zeroed to microeconomic domain of 'Crop farming households' –revise the sentence and land the argument.</p> <p>(c) Table 2 addressed an objective of this study and was highly referenced in the discussion. It should therefore not be kept as an appendix.</p>	<p>We strongly disagree with the reviewer. There is difference between well-known facts a and authoritative pronouncements. The authors have presented well-known facts.</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>It is rather table 3 that addresses the main objective of this study. Table presents the summary of the demographic characteristics.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>(a) The article 'the' in first line of the abstract can be dropped without changing meaning of the phrase.</p> <p>(b) 'Sample size' could better read "size of sample"; the word 'is' can be replaced by "was" since the study had been completed.</p> <p>(c) 'Female headed' should better read "Female-headed"; and 'Male headed' read "Male-headed".</p> <p>Introduction and Literature Review:</p> <p>(a) The highlighted article 'the' can be removed without changing the meaning of the phrases they support;</p> <p>(b) Line 17: 'It' should better read "The sector".</p> <p>(c) Line 18: The phrase 'it plays a vital role' was followed by</p>	<p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>Sample size is correct.</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>many roles and therefore should better read “it plays vital roles”.</p> <p>(d) Line 21: ‘importance role that’ should read “important role which”.</p> <p>(e) The sentence starting from ‘The Ghana’ in line 37 and ends with the word size in line 40’ should be rephrased as follows: The Ghana statistical service [5]...75% of labour in rural sector with relatively higher household sizes but spends annually 1.6 times lower than their urban sector counterparts.</p> <p>(f) Line 43: ‘aim’ should read “aimed”.</p> <p>(g) Line 47: remove ‘etc’ but add “and” before non-governmental organizations.</p> <p>(h) Line 57: ‘farmer’ should read “farm”.</p> <p>(i) Line 70: ‘smaller’ should read “small”.</p> <p>(j) Line 75: remove ‘etc’ but add “and” before cattle.</p> <p>(k) Line 86: ‘farm’ should read “manual”.</p> <p>(l) Line 87: the phrase ‘society to society’ should read “from one society to another”.</p> <p>(m) Line 116: ‘influence’ should read “influenced”</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>(a) Line 122: the phrase ‘by using’ should be replaced with the word “with”.</p> <p>(b) Line 142: remove the word ‘below’.</p> <p>Results and Discussions:</p> <p>(a) Line 180: the word ‘with’ should read “within”; also the word “majority” should be replaced with “relatively high proportion (45%)” since 45% cannot be said to be majority.</p> <p>(b) Line 181: the word ‘with’ should read “within”;</p> <p>(c) Line 182: add the word “of” before 0.3%;</p> <p>(d) Line 184: the word ‘majority’ should be replace with “a good proportion (63.7%)”; also add the word “persons” after 1 to 5.</p> <p>(e) Line 188: the word ‘most’ should be replaced with “A relatively high proportion (43.9%)” since 43.9% cannot be</p>	<p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>It is absolutely correct. The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>said to be most.</p> <p>(f) Line 191: the word 'majority' should be replaced with "a good proportion (62%)".</p> <p>(g) Line 195: drop the word 'below' since the table is referenced with Arabic number in the text.</p> <p>(h) Line 197: the word 'directions' should be replaced with the word "signs".</p> <p>(i) Line 211: The phrase 'female headed' should read "female-headed"</p> <p>(j) Lines 213, 225 and 235: The phrase 'a priori' should be italicized since it is not an English word.</p> <p>(k) Line 228: the word 'shine' should read "shy".</p> <p>(l) Line 229: complete the sentence with the phrase " but rather take part in non-farm activities"; also add the word "status" after Marital; Also change the word 'one' with the word "farmer".</p> <p>Conclusions and recommendations:</p> <p>(a) Line 246: The phrase 'female headed' should read "female-headed";</p>	<p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p> <p>The corrections have been effected (see manuscript)</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The study was well conceived, designed and properly analysed. There was however, need to mention as part of result that the log. Likelihood ratio (LR) statistic (-2LogL) tested joint significance of all included independent variables and was significant at 1.0% alpha level of probability.</p>	