



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_34874
Title of the Manuscript:	REASONS PROMPTING THE ADOPTION OF ORGANIC FERTILIZERS IN VEGETABLE PRODUCTION IN AGOTIME-ZIOPE DISTRICT, GHANA
Type of the Article	Case Study

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The sample size is not explained. For one, 50 appears quite low for the analysis done. Additionally, there is no explanation as to why purposive selection was done. There is need to have a theoretical basis for the sample selected</p> <p>Most of the articles quoted are dated. This indicates a poor job on the literature review. The latest article quoted is 2010 with quite a number in the 1990s yet we are in 2017</p> <p>Literature review does not bring out research gaps that this study is seeking to fill.</p> <p>The recommendation that investors should be incentivized by Government through tax exemptions and subsidies among other things in order for them set up composite sites is impractical and is not supported by evidence. It comes out as a recommendation from the blues</p> <p>Nothing has been mentioned in the literature review about organic certification and its benefits yet this gets inserted at the end as part of the conclusion</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>There are many grammatical mistakes. I picked errors on pages 2, 3, 4(five errors), 5 (two errors), 13 (three errors). The first paragraph on page 6 has unfinished sentences and one of the references does not have the year. The opening sentence on page 7 is a repetition of</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	page 6 (Makokha et al. but the referencing format has been charged and the name has been misspelt. I wonder how some of the predictor variables are measured eg Easy Access, Less Processing Needed, Fertility Status of the Soil, and Less Risk of Plant Injury. On page 13, you talk of “risk of a farmer adopting”. Is it a risk that the farmer adopts organic fertilizers?	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Joseph G. Wang’ombe</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Kenya</i></b>