



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6011
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors influencing Soyabean production and willingness to pay for inoculum use in northern Ghana
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 paper found to be educative but with the following comments. 1. The Title is too long need make it precise 2. Abstract need to be reorganized to be direct for easy understanding 3. Comprehensive procedure on how gas was collected and analyses. 4. Then conclusion also need to be specific and informative	The title is very concise. The words in the title total about 14 which is quite standard. We therefore decided to maintain the title. Some few lines have been added to the original abstract. We do not agree that the abstract is not well-organized for easy understanding. Comprehensive methodology (sampling and method of data collection as well as data analysis) has been provided with slight modifications in response to comments from second and third reviewers. The conclusion is very specific and informative in the current form.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		