



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12025
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF SALES PROMOTION BY COCOA LICENSED BUYING COMPANIES ON ~~COCOA~~ SALES OF FARMERS ~~IN -A CASE STUDY OF~~ WASSA AMENFI EAST DISTRICT ~~OF 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 (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	• Title of the paper should be modify: 'The impact of sales promotion by cocoa licensed buying companies on sales of farmers in Wassa Amenfi East District of Ghana' • Study design: State the 'more scientific method' adopted for collecting and analysing data • Place and duration of study: Why not compare the effect of the sales promotion during the main and light crop seasons for comparison, if season also influence the choice of farmers • Figure 1: some information are not fully displayed • 3.1 (introduction) under result and discussion should be deleted, it's not relevant • Table 3.2 need modification: table title addressing cocoa sales but content it's about cocoa purchase (kg), should rather be amount of cocoa sold (kg) • Table 3.4: modify title to ;effect of sales promotion on cocoa sales..... how sales promotional cocoa sales of farmers • Conclusion: shorten to 4-5 sentences • Recommendation: Too lengthy, modify to key activities in statement form (4.1.1 to 4.1.7)	The topic has been modified The scientific method has been stated Since the study has already been conducted, we would therefore consider this as one of the limitations of this research and therefore other researchers should consider exploring further between two seasons. Figure 1. information has been displayed now. Introduction has been removed. Table 3.2 has been modified now Title has been modified



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• References: Not listed in the order of citation eg. Lundstedt and Parssinen, 2009 was cited first but listed as 34 on the reference page • Re-visit the reference citation and listing requirement of the journal	The conclusion has been shortened
Minor REVISION comments	• Keyword: Include Sales Promotion • <i>et al</i> should be in italics • line 48, 55: Authors' name should be separated from <i>et al</i> & year of publication • line 54, 60 & 99: delete 'see' preceding the authors name • line 75 & 82: Space the joined words and figures • Why was the literacy level of farmers not used as a factor that can influence their choice of sales via promotional programmes provided? • Why is the LBCs not coded and details describe in abbreviations or after tables 3.1, 3.3 & 3.5 just to eliminate bias	It has been included All the other corrections have been effected The study on the literacy level has been included. The research analysed their level of education and its implication on the application of fertilizers and also their knowledge on promotional activities provided by the LBCs.
Optional/General comments		