



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: 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Author described, "A baseline survey was conducted in 3 districts of the Upper East Region of Ghana to assess current postharvest practices and factors influencing long and bulk storage of maize". The area which covered by author were demographic information, cropping system, postharvest operation and losses, storage methods, pest management strategies. But in methodology, author did not mentioned about the approach or even the main considerations. I suggested to explain the section materials and methods clearly. Storage methods and duration (Table: 10 and 11), it was not clear that is there any comparisons with package type and the storage duration. It is appropriate to mention the package type with storage duration, because the methods you described have different effects on stored products. The title specifies the crop and it was not specific in objectives. 	<p>This area has been revised accordingly</p> <p>The aim of table 10 and 11 was to assess their preference for the storage methods and possible reasons for the preference which I believe it did.</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no any captions for the plates you given as well if you need to use plates for explanation use only the important plates which support to explain your findings. Discussions related to other findings were not addressed. 	<p>Improved upon</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work. Good effort. Some important considerations not clearly mentioned during presentation.	