



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19661
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency Analysis of Wheat Farmers of District Layyah of Pakistan
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. The necessary background provided by the introduction is not sufficient. The author failed to provide the state of the art in the field of his study in Pakistan. Consequently, the added value of his study compare to the studies existing in Pakistan is not perceptible. Please build on this 2. A good introduction ends with the announcement of the subsequent sections 3. The author argue that the stratified random sampling was the sampling technique. Then it is worth knowing what were the strata and what is the rationale behind defining them. 4. Please many readers know nothing about your study site. Provide general information on your study site: main economic activity, population size, climate, etc 5. Please discuss more the results of the relationship between Efficiency Estimates and Farm Size. Do not just present the results, try to explain why those results. 6. The explanatory variables included in the Tobit model have to be justified. 7. The conclusion has to be reconsidered. It should include the main results of the study	1) The necessary background is already provided 2) Said points are added 3) Sampling technique is corrected 4) general information on study site is added 5), 6), 7) already clear
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		