



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>  |
| 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)   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | The manuscript is interesting but it needs major revisions before its potential publication. First, the aim should be evidenced in the abstract and introduction sections. Second, the methodological section should be explained in a clearer way. Third, the results should be further discussed and improved also in terms of policy implications. | <b>Part 1 (a)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citations and referencing have all been cross checked and highlighted in yellow after using the required referencing style(vancouver)</li> <li>2. Figures that were in line 303 and 332 have been deleted and figure in table 1 changed to 117 from 11.7 as well as the statements earlier in line 256 changed as shown in yellow</li> </ol> <b>Part 1(b)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aim of the study is evidenced in both the abstract and the introduction</li> <li>2. Methodology has been further explained in a more clearer way and re-arranged; the sub-titles: concepts of efficiency and efficiency estimation methods that earlier appeared under the methods and materials have both been moved to introduction</li> <li>3. Results were further discussed and more policy implications highlighted</li> <li>4. Conclusion and recommendations have been further expanded</li> <li>5. Due to the additions made, reference number 29 was added and other re-arranged to correspond with the numbering in the citations</li> </ol> <p>Note that; all the above were coloured yellow for your information</p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |   |

**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) | There are no ethical issues in this manuscript  |