



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14924
Title of the Manuscript:	RESOURCE-USE-EFFICIENCY AMONG SMALLHOLDER GROUNDNUT FARMERS 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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In the abstract section, the sample size is different to the one given in line 156. You need to check in order to confirm your sample size. 2. Lines 29 to 31: Authors wrote: "Numerous studies in Ghana (<i>cite your references here</i>) and other parts of Africa (<i>cite your references here</i>) have documented Farm management practices" without naming some. You need to cite some authors. 3. Is the sentence in lines 79 to 80 directly linked to the next paragraph starting from line 82? If not please name some authors where you wrote in line 79: "Many authors have analysed part of the world". 4. Lines 248 and 249: the equations 10 and 11 are missing. Please check your numbering. Probably you missed attributing a number to the equations in lines 206 and 209. 5. Review your discussion related to the sub-section 3.1. It's better to discuss Table 1 and then Table 2. Some values in this sub-section are confirmed with those presented in Table 2. For examples: (1) the average household size is 11 people (line 266) but in Table 2 it's 12 people. (2) The average farming experience of groundnut farmers is 12 years (line 272) however; it is 29 years (Table 2). 6. Line 279: authors wrote: "From the table". You need to correct as follows: "From Table 2".	Have corrected it accordingly Lines 29 to 31 are directly linked to line lines 32 to 34 which have those references. Hence, there is no point to cite the reference in lines 29-31. However, the paragraph has been restated to sound better. Yes, lines 79 to 80 are starting points to the next paragraph. Have corrected it accordingly Have reviewed the sub-section 3.1 accordingly. Have corrected it accordingly



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Always put a capital letter in such case. Same as lines 288 and 392. 7. Lines 308 and 309: How could you justify the negative sign of farm size in your study area? 8. Line 325: the maximum level of technical efficiency (line 325) is slightly different to the one in Table 4. 9. Lines 325; 326; 407: the mean of technical efficiency is lightly different to the one in Table 4. Please correct errors in these lines. 10. Table 5 or lines 370 to 375: how could authors justify the implication of the negative sign of household size to the technical efficiency of groundnut production in Tolon district? I do believe that groundnut production in Tolon district is not the main farming activity of surveyed farmers therefore the household labour within the household size mainly spends more times to the principal activity.	Have corrected accordingly Have corrected it accordingly Have corrected accordingly Have corrected accordingly Have corrected accordingly
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	11. Line 157: What are these four communities? 12. Authors presented the distribution of technical efficiency in both Table 4 and Figure 1. It's better to decide for one option rather putting both. 13. Why the reference list is not in alphabetical order? 14. The implementation of the technical efficiency requires tests of null hypotheses such the generalized likelihood ratio-type test. The likelihood ratio test used to test Cobb-Douglas against the translog. You need to demonstrate whether the Cobb-Douglas is better than translog or vice versa regarding the technical efficiency of groundnut production in Tolon district.	Have corrected Have decided to stick to only the table instead of the two. References were done in accordance with the journal guidelines. The GLR was in favour of translog rather than Cobb-Douglas. This has change the functional form used in the study from Cobb-Douglas to Translog which has had a slight effect on some of the discussions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well written and presents a good application of resource use efficiency analysis. Therefore, the sub-section 3.1 needs to be improved. Overall, authors need to follow revisions recommended for the improvement of the manuscript.	All corrections have been effected appropriately.