



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The List of References must be re-checked, since there are few errors in writing the references: listing years, names of authors, etc.</b></li> <li>• 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." Foundation News &amp; Commentary 41(5): 33–36.</li> <li>• 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??</li> <li>• Sugri I. is listed in the text as Sugri I. et al, while in the List of references alone (No et al.)</li> <li>• Another similar error is in the List of References, (Osei-Agyeman <i>et al</i> 2014) was wrongly written</li> </ul>	<p>The 2006 is correct and has been corrected</p> <p>It is Sugri Et al and this has been dully corrected.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the List of References, two names had             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>www.ghanadistricts.com (accessed on 14/08/2014).</li> <li>CTA. Analysis of the Postharvest Knowledge system in Ghana Case study of cassava. <a href="http://knowledge.cta.int/">http://knowledge.cta.int/</a>, accessed on "10/12/2014"</li> </ol> <p>There is no need to indicate when they were accessed.</p> </li> <li>Percentages in few tables were either above or below 100%: Examples: Table 9, 10, 11, 13.  All other tables need to be checked again.</li> <li>In the introduction, authors listed few numbers about yields and areas of some crops. Numbers should be rounded up. There is no need to write big numbers like 889,013 ha),  (...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  <b>Simply, such numbers could be written like 889 thous. ha.</b></li> </ul>	<p>This has been corrected</p> <p>It has been removed</p> <p>It has been removed</p> <p>This has been crosschecked and corrected and the tables highlighted</p> <p>The suggestion is good and corrections effected</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		