



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_49481
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Efficiency of Grasscutter Production (<i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i>) in Osun State, Nigeria: A case of Data Envelopment Approach
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

Reviewer's comment	This Journal article is scientifically robust and technically sound. Topic, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, 4 Tables, Conclusion and Recommendations and References are all of acceptable standard. However, few amendments may be needed to be made in order to meet up with this Journal (AJRAF) format.	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. REFERENCES at the end of this write-up could be re-checked and re-arranged to conform to the accepted Format for this Journal (AJRAF). They could also be numbered as 1. ; 2. And not as (1); (2) and also be re-numbered as they appeared in the body of the work or as required by the Journal.	Noted and duly corrected/effectuated.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 24: Could change spelling of allocatively to allocatively 2. Lines 267 and 268: Table 1. – - Could add to Title of Table as follows – Table 1. Frequency distribution of efficiency index of grasscutter farmers - Could add to the foot notes as follows – Source: Data analysis, 2018; TE – Technical efficiency; AE – Allocative efficiency; EE – Economic efficiency 3. In Lines 286, 291, 295: Could change 'indexes' to 'indices' 4. Line 287: Could change '5%, 1% and 10%' to '10%, 5% and 1%' probability levels, 5. Line 291: Could add and 5% and 's' to level as - TE at 10% and 5% levels of probability. 6. Line 298: Could be put as - Hence extension services increased the 7. Line 303: Could change β_i to β_o 8. Between Lines 317 and 318: Table 4. Could add sub heading as – Measure of efficiency and then put below as follows – Technical efficiency (TE) Allocative efficiency (AE) Economic efficiency (EE) Such that Table 4. Could be more fully explained and stand without referring back. 9. Line 324: Could add 'Nigeria' as- Osun State, Nigeria, using the DEA. Line 333: Could add 'of farmers' as - entries of farmers into grasscutter production 	All observations and suggested corrections have been duly effectuated. The title of Table 4 is ok and as such no need to change it so as not to lose its relevance.
Optional/General comments	Good work.	