



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8625
Title of the Manuscript:	Production Function Analysis of Fish Production in Amansie-West District of Ghana, West Africa
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 <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	Some typographical errors were noticed, in almost all section of the work (two words joined together by lack of space as seen in lines 7). The result and discussion section are not written in a well-constructed and concise manner.	Typographical errors have been corrected, and joined words separated. Joined words may have been caused by changes in system format. The result and discussion section has been revised as deemed suitable to reflect the intentions of the authors and reviewers' suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript appeared to be suffering from verbosity (repetition of definition).	Repetition, where identified has been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Publishing a quality work like this subject is of essence hence, I may suggest that the author(s) fall back to their drawing table to rewrite the manuscript again for clarity and justification.	Manuscript has been revised and proofread by authors to ensure clarity and justification.