



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_21540
Title of the Manuscript:	A Probit Analysis of the Determinants of Fertilizer Adoption by Cocoa Farmers 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• The assertion in citation 1 and 2 (line 13-15) may not hold any longer, because this is as at 2007 and we are in 2015, hence need to be updated. • Avoid focussing on general agricultural technology innovations as we have in line 29-33, line 39-45. These are too general. Focus on adoption of cocoa. You could draw inferences from cocoa producing countries in Africa. There are many works done in this area. • The justification for the study (line 51-54) where the author quoted that the reason for embarking on this research was as a result of lack of data may not be accepted. Lack of access to information by the author could be responsible for making the statement. I suggest that the author should look for other reasons to fine turn the problem statement which is very critical in every research. • Line 55-58 should be deleted. • The methodology 2.1 (line 67-75) is not comprehensive. The author should explain in details how he/she select 80 cocoa farmers among several cocoa farmers and also 4 communities among the several cocoa communities in the area. Tell us the sampling method used in each case. It would be better if the author could re-write the section (2.1) to accommodate this. • On line 121, the last column of table 1 (expected sign) could be deleted to avoid argument by other readers • The explanation on line 165-173 was not link to any table. Link the discussion to table 2	• Ghana is still the 2nd global leading producer. • Noted. In essence, there is need to sometimes go from general to specific. • Information on the adoption of fertilizer by Ghanaian cocoa farmers is still hard to find. Cocoa fertilization is only a recent phenomenon in the country and literature on it is scanty t the moment • Done • Noted, improvements made. • Expected sign gives the direction of influence from the theoretical point of view or previous research. It is useful to give the expected sign. It is not for argument, but to clarify the direction of influence. • Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• On table 2, since access to mass spraying was measured at nominal level, how come you got the mean of 0.69? Please check. You cannot have a mean when nominal values are used. • On table 3 where you have access to mass spraying, how did you arrive at the mean of 0.73, 0.63 and a t-test value of -0.89 when you know that nominal value cannot be used to run t-test? I suggest you delete the variable from the tables 2 & 3. • There is no 5% level of significance in your table 4 for age as indicated in line 206. There is no 3 stars, which according to you is 1%, please correct. • The value of 0.37 in the text (line 234) is different from what is on table as 0.38. please correct • The citation of 30 (line 236) cannot still hold. The study was in 2003 now we are in 2015. I suggest you used another citation.	• Correction made • Good point. But note that here we are talking about the number of adopters of fertilizer who participated in the mass spraying exercise, an actual figure. 73 out of the 80 participated. Same explanation for the non-adopters who participated in the spraying programme. • Corrected • Corrected • A new citation is used
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The recommendation on training of farmers on recommended practices on fertiliser (in the abstract) is not based on findings hence should be deleted. Also the author should streamline what the conclusion in the abstract with that of the conclusion. Recommendation should always be based on finding	• Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I commend the author for the good work done so far. I wish to state that a lot of studies have been done in the area of cocoa adoption, I suggest the author should incorporate the latest findings on cocoa adoption to buttress his/her work.	• The available literature on fertilizer adoption is documented in the paper. • THANKS FOR THE USEFUL COMMENTS