



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_47642
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Efficiency and its Determinants: A Case Study of Cowpea Production in the Western Agricultural Zone of Nasarawa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>)

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>1. Follow the journal's guidelines on citation and referencing. Ensure that all and only those references that were actually cited in the text are included in the list of references at the end of the paper. Double check the year of publication indicated in the citation and in the reference list since there seems to be inconsistencies, unless they are really different references. Double check also whether there is really one author or multiple authors for certain reference since there also seems to be inconsistencies in the in-text citation versus the reference list, unless again they are really different. (There are many of these "seem-to-be" errors in the text. There is a need to check the citations and references one by one.)</p> <p>2. The coefficient of variation for AE in Table 1 should be 117 and not 11.7. With this, there is also a need to revise the statement in line 256.</p> <p>3. The figures in lines 278, 303 and 332 seem to be similar. Retain the figure in line 278 and delete the other two.</p>	<p>Citations and referencing have all been cross checked and highlighted in yellow</p> <p>All the other areas suggested for review, correction or outright removal have been appropriately done and also colored yellow. Figures that were in line 303 and 332 have been deleted and figure in table 1 changed from 11.7 to 117 and statement in line 256 has been revised</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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 feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues in this manuscript