SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_18834**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Post-liberalization import demand for rice in Ghana: trends, determinants and relevant policy implications**
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	**Line 62-63:** 'demand increased from 75,114 tonnes in 1983 to 848,846 tonnes in 63 2011 (an increase of 1030.08 percent)'. Explain in a footnote how demand was measured or calculated. **Line 81-87:** Trends in rice imports, production, total supply and demand in Ghana are known. What else are the authors trying to show using growth rates and the Johansen test? Authors should make this clear since the beginning. The research would bring new insights in understanding the accelerating rice imports issue, if it identifies the new factors that explain differences in growth rates during the post-liberalization period, compared to pre-liberalization, and policy reforms that should come with. **Line 92-95:** Above comment applies here again. Make clear how the said indicators would be related to key hypothetic growth rate determinants, and what would be new during the post-liberalization period. One would be interested in questioning why that period's policy measures did not help curb down the growing import trend and foster a rise in domestic production. **Line 197-199.** 'Based on trade theory and as expressed in equation (10), annual volumes of rice import are presumed to be driven by local rice production, average price of imported rice, domestic demand for rice, and terms of trade index of exports of a named country'. An outstanding author of trade theory should be cited here. Among the explanatory variables, 'terms of trade index of exports' should be specific to rice trade, before	• We really appreciate the reviewer's comments. Suggestions made are well noted and have been generally attended to

	the general trade index for all commodities is considered. I am afraid the latter stands quite far in explaining trends in the rice sub-sector. Moreover, rather than using absolute price of imported rice, the relative price 'import/domestic' price ratio would have been more relevant. Not doing this, authors should at least include the average domestic price among explanatory variables. If not able to do this, authors should indicate that limitation and explain why. **Line 303:** Table 4. I guess '1961-1982' is pre- and '1983-2011' is post. Indicate clearly. **Line 320:** Title of section 4.2 'Response of Rice Import Demand' is confusing and does not reflect the content of table 5. Consider rephrasing. **Line 328:** Pre- and post-liberalization results should be separated. This does not appear clearly in table 5. Authors should have inserted a dummy variable in the model to account for that. **Line 331-360:** Authors tried to explain the results/trends by referring to variables (yields, infrastructure) that were not statistically investigated and should have been found in national agricultural and trade databases. Authors should mention this limitation. For example, e.g. infrastructure could have been measured by 'km of paved roads/total paddy area cultivated'. **Line 405-406:** 'In summary, recent surges in rice imports, based on current estimates, are founded on increasing domestic demand for rice'. This result is obvious and may not need econometrics. Is there any rice re-exportation in Ghana? If that's the case, demand in neighbor countries may also explain the trends, even more than domestic demand. **Line 407-409:** The variables 'local rice quality' and 'local rice competitiveness' (e.g. 'import parity/domestic' price	

	ratio; 'quality/price' ratio) were not investigated by the model, and are used speculatively here by the authors to explain import growth trends. This is not appropriate.	
Minor REVISION comments	**Line 21:** 'granting' instead of 'levying'. The latter applies for taxes, not for subsidies. **Line 32:** 'cultivation of more profitable crops, such as vegetables including okra, …' instead of 'cultivation of more profitable vegetables like okra, …' The reason is that rice is not a vegetable.	
Optional/General comments	Authors emphasized too much econometrics of aggregates in this paper, rather than addressing empirically the deep reasons of main changes in rice sector growth in Ghana between pre- and post-liberalization periods. If long time series would not be available for all relevant variables in national statistics databases, a few critical ones (e.g. relative prices, wages, rural migration) behind domestic production should have been addressed for the short-run analysis. Nonetheless, the paper provides a wealth of practical application of econometrics and interesting interpretation. Policy recommendations are also relevant, though not sufficiently substantiated by direct statistical evidence.	