SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJAST_12911**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Smallholder farmers' preferences for improved cocoa technologies in Ghana: Multinomial choice analyses**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**None**	
Minor REVISION comments	- Suggest including future work studies that can be extended to improve the model. - The reference format should be checked according to journal guideline - Suggest to shorten the title to make it easier to capture/attract the audience - Suggest under introduction to include a chart/figure of general cocoa processing steps	
Optional/General comments	None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**University of Nottingham, Malaysia**