



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_20714</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determinants of farmers' satisfaction with the price of cocoa in Ghana</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Introduction</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good and precise explanation.</li> <li>• I do not understand why liberalization policy issue was included in the introduction even though it was considered as one of the determinant of farmers' satisfaction.</li> <li>• The main issue should be farmers' satisfaction. It was not discussed in detail.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b><u>Literature Review</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theoretical and empirical reviews of literature on determinants of farmers' satisfaction were not discussed. The author should, at least, explain some previous researches on the determinant of farmers' satisfaction.</li> <li>• Therefore, there is lack of information that can be used by the author to support the variables that included in the model.</li> <li>• Therefore, I could say that the literature review is so weak.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b><u>Research Method</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The steps of methodology are almost complete. It covers almost all the topics related to the methodology. However, I hope the author should be able to justify all variables included in the model by using the theory or previous studies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. <b><u>Results and Discussion</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a good coverage.</li> <li>• However, the discussion of findings should be supported by the previous findings.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The method for getting the results in Table 3 was not explained in Methodology.</li></ul> <p>5. <u>Conclusion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It seems that the author's recommendations to policy maker are not related to research findings. The author keeps raising the issue of liberalization policy, even though I think it is not related to this paper.</li></ul>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well written.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sallahuddin Hassan
Department, University & Country	Department of Economics, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia