



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5856
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Challenges of Civil Society Networks in Ghana: A Comparative Study of Four Networks</i>
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	The paper started with a very good background of CSO networks and their expected roles in Ghana. The main argument, challenges of CSO networks, is well followed throughout the paper. The research identified the proper way of selecting the CSO networks. However, there are two major limitations of this paper: 1. No theories have been used to substantiate the research findings. If the research findings would have been attached with theory/theories, this would make a real difference in the field. 2. The author/authors used purposive sampling, meaning they will not be able to generalize their research result for other CSO network as purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling. This is a major limitation of the paper, as it will limit the ability to direct what these networks should do in future. This paper is allowed to make recommendation for only	This paper has been revised with the Resource mobilization theory that underpins network formation and also coalition building and this same theory is used to substantiate the findings and conclusions. This is duly highlighted at pages of the revised manuscript. Authors agree with reviewer that conclusions emanating from a purposive sample are applicable to only the CSOs that were sampled in the study and have made revisions accordingly as seen in page numbers.....which is highlighted in bold font.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	those CSOs which have been purposively sampled but cannot make recommendation for other CSOs left out from the present research. Minor problems: 1. I am not convinced with the word “desk research”. The description of the “desk research” tells us the author/s used content analysis. 2. Line 98, 115, 228: punctuation mark is missing. 3. Line 75: sentence construction is not correct. “Considering this factor, two networks each... 4. Line 92 and 93: Do not abbreviate. Tell reader what is NNED, NGND, NETRIGHT, WANEP 5. Page 8: The paper used pie chart to present the data but they do not have data measured at interval level. Instead of pie chart, they are supposed to use simple bar diagram (even though it may look bit repetitious) or could present in a table. If it is a table, a reader would know the sample size. Suggestions:	1. I don’t agree with the reviewer’s attempt to equate “content analysis” which is a rigorous, independent data analysis method with a “desk research” that simply denote a review of the literature on civil society networks in Ghana. I don’t think these two are the same 2. Punctuation marks inserted at lines 98, 115 and 228 3. The sentence in line 75 has been revised and highlighted in bold font. 4. The full meaning of abbreviations done and highlighted in bold
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. Since there is no way, the author/s could change the sampling plan, it is better to tell that their recommendations are limited to only those CSOs which were sampled 2. Yes, the author/authors could add a theoretical framework at this point of the work. 3. Minor problems can be solved easily The paper can be accepted after following the suggestions mentioned above	• This has been done • This has also been done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		