



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24455
Title of the Manuscript:	Some Okra Production Decisions and Farmers' Awareness of Meloidogyne species Infection in two Agro-ecologies of 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>)



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		
Minor REVISION comments	The following are the comments that need to be addressed: Line 26: NARP, 1993 – not included in the reference list. Line 39: Adu et al (1992) – not included in reference list. Line 57, 58, 127 and table 2: This symbol <60 or >60 - Authors should be consistent with the table. Line 62: Most farmers..... – Please refer us to the relevant table. Line 69: Farmers' experience – this is not on table 2 but 3. Line 69: Majority of the farmers – please refer us to the relevant table. Line 118: Management – spelling error Line 148: Insurance? – spelling error? Discussions: More information can be added. The purpose of this part is to compare current results with what has been reported before. In the current manuscript there is no comparison. Conclusions: How does this unawareness affect yields?	NARP, 1993 – has been added to the reference list. The reference is 'Adu, 1992' and not Adu et al. – correction has been made appropriately. Changes have been made in the text in relation to the <60 or >60 appropriately. Reference has been made to the related table (3) as pointed out. The relevant table (3) has been referred to. The spelling error has been dealt with. The spelling error has been dealt with. Results on nematodes awareness has been compared with what has been reported in the past (2004) in the discussion and highlighted. Unawareness of nematodes ultimately impacts negatively on yield of the crop.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper can be accepted as a short communication after minor revision. The data was not analysed statistically and there is not enough scientific basis.	Authors are of the view that the paper be accepted as an original research paper considering the large sample size, number and widespread of the locations. However, this Reviewer thinks otherwise. We therefore leave it to the discretion of the Editorial Team to make their own judgement based on merit and good image of the journal.