



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 (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	I suggest that the author highlights with statistics and reference(s) the importance (gross domestic product, exports, employment, household income, etc) of agriculture in Ghana. The author can then highlight with statistics and reference(s) the importance of soybean crop in agriculture and economy of households in Ghana and northern Ghana in particular. Then the author can describe the factors affecting soybean production in the country and government effort to address the constraints to production. The term “inoculum” is not defined in the text. Line 22: The reference should be arranged according to year's i.e. 1970 before 1989 and then 2012. Also 1970 and 1989 are outdated. Look for recent literature. Line 87 and 89: Tables should start from one i.e. Table1..... Line 102 to 118: Cobb Douglas production function is wrongly run. How do you find the Ln of the binary variables? The dependent variable is	The general information about agriculture and its contribution to Ghana's economy is well-documented and in recent times, researchers have tended to focus on the main research issues rather than report on general things which are well known. However, to satisfy the curiosity of the reviewer, we have provided a short paragraph on that in the introduction of the revised manuscript. Definition/explanation for inoculum has also been provided and highlighted in the revised manuscript. The dates on line 22 have been arranged according to the suggestion by the reviewer. However, 1970 and 1989 references have been maintained because we are describing the history of soyabean and this cannot be captured in a very recent document. Any recent article will only quote from the old ones; so we are maintaining these rather old but original



SDI Review Form 1.6

	OK but for the independent variables you need to add at least three(3) of the inputs used in the production of the production of soybeans, e.g. Land area in acres, seed in kg, labour in man-days and other inputs like inoculum in whatever unit of measurement. You don't need X_1-X_8. Remove bracket from line 105. This has to be re-run and report your findings with economic implication of each of the significant variables. Line105 to 145: The equations have to be numbered starting from 1. Line 206 to line 211: Table 3.1 should be table 2. What are the economic implications of your findings? Line 213: Change table 3.1 to table 2. Line 215: Put a sub-heading here. Line 216-225: change table 3.2 to table 3. What are the economic implications of your findings? Add the summary of the inputs used in the production of soybeans. For instance mean of seed used and compare with recommended rate of planting. Line231 and 240: change figure 3.1 to figure 1. Line 243: put a heading here and change table3.3	sources of the information. Suggestion on Table numbering has been taken and used to modify the manuscript. The comment on the production function has been taken. We notice that the ln was inadvertently made to affect even the dummy variables. This has been corrected. Also, land, labour and seed quantities have been included in the model as explanatory variables. Bracket on line 105 has been removed. Table 3.1 on lines 206 to 211 only provides descriptives for the sample. It is not advisable to draw inferences from such information to the extent that economic implications are drawn from them. However, a modest attempt has been made to add a few lines to show some implications. A summary of inputs used in production has been added to the original table2 (now table3) in the revised version.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to table 4 and table 3.4 to table 5. Also explain each table separately. Line274 to 287: this has to be re-run as suggested above and then report in line with the new result. Also you need to tell us the economic meaning of each of the significant variables. You also need to effect this in your abstract. Change table 3.5 to table 6. Line 296: change table 3.6 to table7. Line 308 to 317: put a heading here. Your findings should be explained in economic terms. What are the economic interpretations of the significant variables?	The production function has been rerun. Findings have been explained in economic terms.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		