



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_40457
Title of the Manuscript:	WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR BIOFERTILIZERS AMONG GRAIN LEGUME FARMERS IN NORTHERN GHANA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 235 specified the WTP equation. I was expecting some theoretical justification for the inclusion of those variable. Certainly this is not the first WTP study on biofertilizers in Africa. I think you should provide a solid justification for including these variables in equation 1. This should further reinforce you're a priori expectations in Table 4. You mentioned in Lines 325-328 that credit is only statistically significant for farmers in the Upper West Region. It is however surprising that you went ahead to conclude that "...farmers who have access to credit are more likely and willing to pay for Biofix". I think this is misleading. There was no statistically significant result for the Northern region! Please revise. I observed that you used the double-bounded dichotomous choice format of the contingency evaluation method to estimate farmers' WTP; and also the determinants of farmers WTP using the maximum likelihood approach as indicated in Lines 351-353. It is quite surprising that there was no discussion of the maximum likelihood approach in the methodology. It is crucial to provide some discussion of the ML approach in the section preceding the results and discussion section. The study failed to compare the results to those of existing WTP studies from other regions. I think this is a major weakness that has to be dealt with. How does the results in Ghana compare with those in other developing countries? How do you come to the conclusion that "...the prospects for the sale of biofertilizers on the Ghanaian market for grain legume farmers are bright", when you have empirically demonstrated that the mean amounts farmers are willing to pay is far below ex-factory price? This is conclusion is unfounded and grossly misleading! The third recommendation (Lines 378-381) is completely baseless and contrary to economic thought. How on earth could agro-dealers/marketers price their products far below their ex-factory prices to meet farmers WTP! Assuming their losses could be recouped overtime, how long would it take for that to occur? Where is the evidence to support this? I this this recommendation is completely spurious and should be scrapped. 	<p>Some determinants of willingness to pay identified in previous literature have been included (Lines 226-239)</p> <p>Issue in relation to credit revised (Lines 336-337)</p> <p>Discussion on ML approach included (Lines 221-225)</p> <p>Revised (Lines 324-327) and Lines (331-332)</p> <p>My conclusion has some basis with the issue of chemical fertilizers which though are much needed by farmers, prices makes it difficult for farmers to acquire hence the need for subsidy. Hence if some subsidy is also put in place for biofertilizers to lower cost, farmers will be willing to purchase as I recommended in my recommendations among others</p> <p>Third recommendation scrapped per advise</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 9: SFM is being used for the first time so write it in full. Line 9: I am not sure why the use of "perquisite" in this sentence. I think the word is confused for another word here. Consider using "prerequisite". Line 50: ISFM used here for the first time so write in full. Lines 74&75: I suggest that you state the main objectives in a sentence than to list them. These could follow the sentence that ends in line 70 "...farmers in Northern Ghana." 	<p>Revised (Line 9)</p> <p>Corrected (Line 10)</p> <p>Revised (Lines 50-51)</p> <p>Revised (Lines 71-73)</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>5. Line 92: Check the citation for “Deepali and Gangwar, 2010”. The in-text citation slightly differs from that in the references.</p> <p>6. Line 103: I think you can do without the word “professional” in that sentence.</p> <p>7. Line 111: Check the in-text citation. I guess it is Ulimwengu et al (2011).</p> <p>8. Lines 112&113: Consider revising the sentence “.....farmers with access to information and extension services are less likely to be WTP for information service”. It is not clear.</p> <p>9. Line 149: Please check the citation for Randall et al., 1974. The citation style in the reference appears different from all others.</p> <p>10. Lines 300&301: The sentence ends “...as presented in Table 7”. I think it should read “are presented in Table 7”</p> <p>11. Lines 317-323: Check the line spacing. It appears different from the other lines.</p> <p>12. Lines 369-381: I think it is possible to present the recommendations in sentences without necessarily labelling them.</p>	<p>Corrected (Line 93-94)</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Checked and revised (Line 235)</p> <p>Sentence revised (Lines 236-237)</p> <p>Citation revised (Lines 459-461)</p> <p>Sentence revised (Line 307)</p> <p>Spacing corrected</p> <p>Revised (Lines 378-386)</p>
Optional/General comments	The paper is generally good and makes some contribution to the existing literature. It has some implications for agricultural policy, especially in northern Ghana.	