

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_93696
Title of the Manuscript:	Factor affecting Purchase of Quality Wood: Understanding Perceptions of Wood Workers using Logistic Regression Model
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:

<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

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>The manuscript partly describes technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. In the manuscript submitted for evaluation, the authors propounded the perceptions of wood workers using logistic regression model on the factors affecting the purchase of quality wood. In the current global need for sustainable utilization of the forest, wood quality devoid of natural defects and irregularities, factors related to the environment and the effects of biological agents are of key importance. The manuscript contains 9 pages of text with a table and references. It has a layout and division into chapters typical of research works. In the content, the authors refer to 18 items of world literature from the years 2004-2014, sequentially numbered and placed at the end in the list of bibliographies (one publication is from 1990). However, there are some few flaws that require to be corrected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract contains the most important information. However, I believe that the sixth sentence can be revised (line 7-10) for better grammatical construction. <p>Introduction. In general, the introduction is correctly written, although it contains some general descriptions at the beginning that fill the text. Write down what's new in your research (Every wood worker knows that pest and diseases and other wood defects reduces the quality/strength of wood and so would avoid such wood for structural works). Give a good justification of the research topic undertaken. Write what has already been done on this topic. Write what are the gaps in knowledge on this topic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Methodology. The research methods should be supplemented and some ambiguities clarified. The Logit Model description should rather be described under methods. 3. Results and discussions. Overall, the quality of the discussions is very average. The authors description of the use of Logit regression was poor. I suggest they read about it to grasp the basics of it before attempting to use it. 4. References. Check the list of publications to include (Bumgardner et al., 2007) or delete. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key words - match keywords to the content of the work except regression that must be changed to 'Logistic regression technique'. 2. Second sentence in the Introduction, 'Bumgardner et al., 2007' is supposed to be [In parenthesis] and better still appear rearrange the references in the text. What is new in your research (gap in knowledge) is not clearly stated. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, the text is properly prepared, however, it requires additions and corrections. The scientific quality is average. The methodology was not clear and should be clarified, the results checked and the discussion better written. As I have doubts about the authors' understanding of the statistical analytical methods, I suggest presenting an elaborative description of the analysis employed will be useful. In its present form, the manuscript requires many corrections and additions. I believe that it cannot be published in this form, so I suggest that you insist on its revision.</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

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rogerson Anokye
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana