



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10773
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Agricultural Export Trade: Case of Fresh Pineapple Exports from Ghana
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	- I couldn't see framework that author mentioned as main objective of this study. - Author has to explain clearly about approach of methodology and justify why using this? - with respect the policy recommendation i feel that Statements, are not derived from the results of this study; as such those policy recommendations cannot be said to come from the study. - the result and discussion is over summarized such that the specific objectives are not clearly treated - there was no reference in introduction and also he/she just used 29 references for this article that is not acceptable to me. With this references not me other researchers also cannot say is it Author words? Add more references to increase value of your study....	I really appreciate the reviewer's comments. • However, in response to his/her claim of not seeing any mention of the objective for this study, I have highlighted the objective (exactly as quoted in the original work) in the revised paper with a light blue colour (to differentiate it from the corrections made) in the introduction. • Comment on the approach of methodology and justification has been addressed/attended to in the revised version • Just as the impact of relevant economic and policy variables are never felt directly, but through some channels, our initial policy recommendations werelinked to potential channels that need policy attention, instead of focusing solely on the results. Deeming the reviewer's claim however valid, policy recommendations have been revised. • In contrast to his/her claim that the results and discussion section has been over-summarized, I (on behalf of all the authors of this article) tend to disagree. Before commenting on the results for each of the variables, we always made sure that a much comprehensive ground is created for the reader to understand associations noted between trade indicators and drivers from



SDI Review Form 1.6

		previous studies and what is actually observed in ours. So, in as much as the reviewer has every right to express his opinion, I refute his/her claim • As a fellow reviewer, one thing I do know is that, the introductory section of an article is where the problem or issue to be investigated is clearly stated. This section is not necessarily a literature review section for authors to be quoting all sorts of references. For originality sake, the introductory part is expected to be more of the author's words rather than quoting others. In spite of this perception however, we clearly acknowledged two important reports in the introductory part (both in the original work and in the revised), yet the reviewer claims he/she did not see any reference. I have therefore highlighted the two reports acknowledged in the introduction with light green colour (to differentiate it from the corrections made). In addition, the reviewer wants us to cite more references to increase the value of our study, which I deem inappropriate a suggestion. Value of a study is not based on the number of references cited but on the quality of the content. We only cited references we deemed relevant and useful for the issue we investigated. Citing unnecessarily is not what is needed, but being able to linked citations with findings is what is more important and that is exactly what has been
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		done in this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The study doesn't show whether or not the existing policies are consistent with the existing pattern of production and export.	In response to this comment, as exactly quoted in the original work and in the revised document, I have highlighted in light blue (to differentiate it from the corrections made) in the literature review section the part where we explicitly made mention of the objective of current economic policy reforms of Ghana ("The main objective of the current economic policy reforms of Ghana is to promote export-led growth through agriculture and to enhance international competitiveness"). Measures have been instilled to promote export growth of all commodities prioritized under the agricultural diversification project (1991-1999) in Ghana. Yet response for some of the commodities including pineapples, rubber and coffee has since the year 2004 been quite gloomy, hence the whetting of our curiosity to investigate how various export drivers are steering pineapple exports from Ghana and to make relevant policy recommendations.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Limitation? Future research?	The only limitation we have in this study is limited number of observations because pineapple exports from Ghana started in 1984.