



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26235
Title of the Manuscript:	Socioeconomic Determinants of Rice Production among Small-scale Farmers in the Shama-Ahanta East District of Ghana
Type of Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Line 24-45, Need for consistency between use of %, percentages Line 49. Rephrase, there is repetition in this line Line 51-53, split the two points for instance stop at 2014 and start new sentence. Line 68, "In order to achieve this however", there is need for brevity Line 73, rephrase as follows...Information from this study will be useful to..... for Line 80. Rephrase as follows. The study was conducted in..... Line 80 remove this ... As financial and other logistic resources would allow Line 85 should read as follows...rice is the main crop Line 88, what happened to rice production in the district between 2008-2014. Show its relative importance. Can the authors add the following under description of the study site; predominant soil type, average temperatures, GPS coordinates for the district, and population density. Line 94 is contrasting with line 80. I would suggest that you mention that the 5 sites were selected based on convenience sampling. Line 96, the reference is old again. There is now a new edition by Scheaffer, Mendenhall III, Ott and Gerow. Line 1997. I still feel the authors are not clear here. How is the sample size distributed among the 5 communities and how was the figure of 320 arrived at. They can reference the page number on Schaeffer if they do not mind. Line 101, indicate that data was entered and analysed in SAS version... Line 114-122, use subscripts for equations. Line 107, reference is a bit old (Amemiya (1973) suggests a maximum likelihood). I suggest that the authors could use the following reference. Long, J. S. (2001). Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Line 124: after explanatory variables put (Xi) Line 141, table 2 does not show data. It shows results. So choose the one which you want to use Line 150, in the table, the subheading should be mean/proportion Line 151, 152 data or results? These terms are different and should not be used interchangeably Line 156, can we talk of a farmer who is 11 years? Line 166 is misplaced. Is it not aa recommendation already? Line 171, what is the source of the information? Line 172-173, where is the issue of migrants coming from? Reconcile the issue of access and ownership. Does one need to own land in order to access it? I thought farmers could still rent land from those who have it. Line 181, The authors need to be consistent with rounding off of coefficients, standard error and t-values. They also need to rerun their model. I got the following t-values when I cross checked their results Education 4.3220	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Household size -2.5510 Output price 1.4607 Line 187-255, authors should recognise the differences between significance at 10%, 5% and 1%. These are different levels of significance for instance 10% is marginally significant, 5% significant and 1% is very significant. 196, I do not agree WITH THE AUTHORS on the issue of different estimation methods as a reason for the difference in results Line 205. Need for consistency in referring to literature. Line 208-216, mention issues of labour efficiency in your reasoning for instance a large household with higher labour efficiency. Line 236, are we talking of male rice farmers or male headed households who grow rice? Line 239: rephrase to These results and not this results Line 245-249, explain further why access to extension improves yield Line 249 and 250, Haq (2011) is talking about contact with extension and not access. Can the authors reconcile the two. What happens to the model if you put contact with extension (number of times) and not a binary variable like access to extension? Line 257. Authors should revisit problem before the recap on important results. Line 262-275. What is the conclusion from this study? Line 271. Where is the issue of private extension officers coming from? The study should have enquired about it.	
--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Byron Zamasiya</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe</i>