



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_48378
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perception on irrigation farming and the factors influencing access to irrigable lands in Northern Region, 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>)

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	<p>Good empirical research study very much fit for publication by AFSJ. However, some modifications need to be done on the paper before it is considered for publication.</p> <p>Although the paper is relatively good, it is too descriptive to a falt. More should be done to incorporate analytical/inferential statistics in the study in order to give it more scientific robustness and technical soundness.</p> <p>At the level of location of the study area, the goeographical coordinates (latitue and longitude) of the area under study should be provided. And if possible a map of the area of study should be provided to enhance visualization.</p> <p>At the level of data analysis, the statistical software used for data analysis should be stated and the rationale behind the use of the statistical software explained.</p> <p>The discussion of findings should be in-depth and should be done in a comparative fashion. Effort should be made to compare and contrast the findings of the study with the findings of other research works conducted in the same field of study. This will give the findings of the paper more relevance.</p>	<p>A general proof reading of the manuscript was done and the corrections highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>A switching regression was estimated. This was detailed under data analysis and section 3.6</p> <p>Both coordinates and map was provided.</p> <p>Software used (STATA and SPSS) were mentioned and justified.</p> <p>Where available literature exist, the authors compared their result with the empirical literature. This appeared low due to the less availability of qualitative literature on the subject.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Good empirical paper fit for publication by AFSJ. However, the aforementioned comments and evaluations should be taken into account before the paper is considered for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	