



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_20714
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of farmers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa 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 (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	<p>Check line 56 and see if you mean "farmers" in place of the word "buyers". Assuming that the sentence that began in line 62 is your general objective, what are the specific objectives of the paper? You need to specify the specific objectives because your results and discussions are expected to be weaved around them! In your description of variables, why did you treat education as a dummy? How did you define "not educated"? I suggest you use number of years of spent in formal education. In line 184, how did you obtain the result when you treated education as a dummy variable? For correctness, check the sentences in lines 164 and 188; 90%?. Define the asterisks in the t- test column in Table 3. Indicate the sources of the tables. I think they are from the field survey; then state so.</p> <p>Please specify your recommendations as opposed to lumping them under conclusion section. Make sure you are guided by the specific objectives of the study in the discussion, conclusion and recommendations.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>What is the need for adding "second level heading" in some headings. Note that 2.1 and 2.2 have the same inscription but are written differently. I hope you can spot the difference.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is good for publication.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Odinakachukwu Ejiogu
Department, University & Country	Department of Agricultural Economics, Imo State University, Owerri, Nigeria