



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_14959
Title of the Manuscript:	Status Of Postharvest Operations In Upper East Region of Ghana: The Case Of Maize Producers
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: Editorial Comments

	<u>Editor's Comment:</u>	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The List of References must be written in alphabetical order. • The List of References must be re-checked, since there are few errors in writing the references: listing years, names of authors, etc. • According to the APA style, which is the most widely used and the most popular, the year comes after the names, not at the end. Example: Draper, Lee. 2000. "Goal: Stronger Nonprofits—How to 'Do' Capacity Building." <i>Foundation News & Commentary</i> 41(5): 33–36. • Years in two names were wrong: For an example, Edusah, S. E 2006 was listed in the text , while in the List of references was listed Edusah, S. E 2007 Which one is the correct?? • Sugri I. is listed in the text as Sugri I. et al, 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>while in the List of references alone (No et al.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another similar error is in the List of References, (Osei-Agyeman <i>et al</i> 2014) was wrongly written• In the List of References, two names had<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. www.ghanadistricts.com (accessed on 14/08/2014).2. CTA. Analysis of the Postharvest Knowledge system in Ghana Case study of cassava. http://knowledge.cta.int/, accessed on "10/12/2014" <p>There is no need to indicate when they were accessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Percentages in few tables were either above or below 100%: Examples: Table 9, 10, 11, 13. <p>All other tables need to be checked again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the introduction, authors listed few numbers about yields and areas of some	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>crops. Numbers should be rounded up. There is no need to write big numbers like 889,013 ha),</p> <p>(...in Ghana, occupying up to 1,023,000ha on arable land compared to rice (197,000ha), millet (179,000ha), sorghum (243,000ha), cassava (889,013ha), yam</p> <p>Simply, such numbers could be written like 889 thous. ha.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Editor's Details:

Dr. Jamal Alrusheidat
Assistant and Consultant to Director general for Extension Education
Director of Extension Education Department, National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE), Amman, Jordan