



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_39874
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness and Adoption of Improved Sweet potato Varieties in Ghana
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	TITLE: The word Adoption explicitly will imply awareness too; therefore the word awareness could be omitted in the title. ABSTRACT: This is the scientific paper, thus abstract must be a singled paragraphed section. The bolded statements should be omitted and written in one paragraph but must include all the contents from introduction to conclusion and recommendations. INTRODUCTION: it is ok METHODOLOGY: It well presented, but author, must explain how the random selection process was conducted in the selection the respondents. RESULTS: Results from logit model (Table 3&4) on the awareness and adoption are only presented B-coefficients, but under categorical model which measure the likelihood, the best estimates which prostrate the utility derived from adoption or not are marginal effects and odds. Therefore, author could include them and use in the interpretations.	The abstract as written was dictated by the style of the journal Agreed but in the case of this paper, the focus was on what are the factors likely to determine awareness and adoption. The utility derived at from the choice was not considered. However it is another viable study that can be explored in subsequent writings.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is good	