



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19866
Title of the Manuscript:	Cost efficiency of NERICA producing households in Ghana: a modified non-neutral stochastic frontier analysis
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	1) 91: 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS should be like this 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS remove 0 from others chapters name. Use only standard format e.g. 2) 92: TABLE 1: Summary of Variables in Stochastic Frontier Cost Function and Inefficiency Model. These variables are calculated should be the part of result and discussion chapter. 3) All the Tables have no source of the data. e.g. Field survey data, 2011 or Auther calculation survey data 2011 4) Table 1 : Please explain this table in words. 5) 107-108 lines should be change accordingly. 6) 279: Table 1 of Kodde and Palm (1986, p. 1246). Where is it? 7) 294: Thus there is district effect in cost inefficiency in the region...what? 8) 327-328 *= not significant at any conventional level, all other estimates are significant at 0.01 Values in parenthesis are t-ratios,, Please explain so that reflect an exact meaning.	Agreed, changes effected Table 1 gives a summary of the field data and is the reason it is placed near the data description. Change effected for tables 1 and 2, the headings for the rest of the tables clearly indicate estimates are derive by author from the field data Table 1 only summarises the data used in the estimation models and is self explanatory. Further explaining it will unnecessarily add to the text Agreed, change effected Agreed, change effected as Table 1 in Kodde and Palm (1986) Agreed, change effected as the level of efficiency of the farmers may vary depending on the district within which a farm is located. Agreed, change effected as The equal sign has been removed to convey the message, estimates with the sign (*) are not statistically significant at any of the conventional levels (i.e. 1%, 5%, and 10%). The phrase values



SDI Review Form 1.6

		in parenthesis are t-ratios is deleted while a new column has been added to list only the t-ratios
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Rephrase: 30-31 lines 2) 73: Battese.....what is this? 3) 78: The main advantage of the stochastic frontier is...What? 4) Per hectare in text should be write like this ha⁻¹ 5) 309: There will also be a...remove it and rephrase this sentence. 6) 343: This implies that there is district effect in production...what? 7) 350: Rephrase this line. 8) 353-354 rephrase these lines.	Agreed, change effected as Rice is the second most important staple food after maize in Ghana and its consumption keeps increasing over the years due to population growth and change in consumer habits Agreed, change effected as [9]. The main advantage of he stochastic frontier is its ability to account for random noise beyond the control of the farmer Agreed, change effected as ha⁻¹ Rephrased as ...and that the location of a farm according to district influences the level of efficiency Author disagrees and therefore maintains previous format Author disagrees and therefore maintains previous format
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	References are not in order. Overall manuscript is very interesting. References need refinement. The following changes must be incorporated and accept the manuscript.	