



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22315
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Analysis of Allocative Efficiency among Fadama Food Crop Farmers in Adamawa State, Nigeria
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	The paper could make do with pertinent editorial corrections. Line 13 after who were..... Line 18/19, the use of allocative, allocatively and allocation could be amended, using alternative words. Line 26: keywords. Author can re-order the listed words. E.g. allocative efficiency, food crop production, Fadama, Adamawa, etc	The comments raised are valid and have been addressed accordingly. You may wish to refer to the lines where observations were made and see how they were respectively addressed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Editorials can be improved. Line 40: continued ... to attract attention....owing to Table 1: How come the significance of "farming experience" under the inefficiency model with a t-ratio of -0,065?	Line 40: There is a missing link but that has been corrected. Editorials improved Table 1: The t-ratio of farming experience is not significant at that value; hence, detailed discussion of the variable in the earlier submission removed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		