



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7250
Title of the Manuscript:	NERICA Adoption and Impacts on performance of Rice Producing Households in Ghana: Implications for Research and Development
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• The models used are appropriate based on the data used to test specific hypotheses. However, the author should clarify the following details on the propensity score matching method: • Which propensity score matching methods did the author use? Common practice is that you use at least two approaches to compare the results • Why are the results of the average treatment effects not reporting the treatment and control groups? • How did the author address the heterogeneity effect in the analysis?	• The nearest neighbour matching approach was used for the discussion in the study; however, results from other matching methods have been included in the text as recommended. • The treatment and control groups have been shown in the results. • Assessing heterogeneous effect was not the focus of the study. Moreover, the sampled rice farmers were largely males.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• I don't think Ghana should be included in the key words. What are key words in scientific research? • The author can make the article more relevant by including a sub-section on policy implications.	• Ghana has been removed from the keywords. • The policy relevance of all the results has been captured in the discussions. A separate sub-section on this will be a duplication of contents.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well written and contributes to advancement of literature.	
---	--	--