

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJAEES/2194
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF GENDER DIFFERENTIALS IN SWEET POTATOES PRODUCTION OUTPUT IN OSUN STATE

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Authors have significantly improved the paper as suggested by reviewer. However, this paper needs to further revise. There are some ambiguous results. For instance, male owned farmers have more farm land, use more fertilizers and tractor, employ more labour (man-days), including planting materials and capitals, but their output per hectare is lower than female owned-farm. This needs to be addressed somewhere why shows this result despite using more inputs by male farmers than female farmers. One way to check consistency is to calculate or estimate: output and inputs (labour days, cash/capital, fertilizer use) per hectare, but not in aggregate form. One possible reason for this may be that female owned farms are mostly rented one, while male owned farms are mostly inherited. Maybe, female rented land for commercial purposes, so they may have more incentives to work and to get benefits from the rented land. On other hand, male owned farms which are mostly inherited may cultivate for household consumption (and so on). Moreover, it would be plausible to present also the number of adult member in addition to total family size, because it matters more how many adult members are in the family rather than how many family members. Some coefficients (e.g., potatoes vines in kg and quantity of agrochemical) estimated in CD frontier function are relatively high, generally if all explanatory variables are converted into log forms, then the estimated coefficients should not so high except coefficient of constant term. CD Frontier Function estimations are also not in standard format. High t-value in Table 6 also implies that there might be something wrong. Maybe data points are serially correlated. Likewise, asterisk [(*) in Table 6] should put in the coefficient terms but not in t-value. Authors should present regression results as in the standard international journal format(or the standard format of published journal of Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology if any). In addition, I did not find diagnosis tests (e.g., heteroscedasticity & multicollinearity) of the regression results. Finally, the average of female farmers is 3.90 (Table 1), I think this is typing error. The authors need to look carefully all issues to publish this paper in the journal.	The possible reason for the great deviation of male output to female output had been addressed on line 236. Information on the total number of household vis a vis their age bracket had been explained on line 186-171. Providing another column for number of adult member may be too cumbersome for this kind of study. The diagnosis tests were presented on Table 6 where the Log likelihood function, sigma, gamma and LR test were presented. Likewise, asterisk [(*) in Table 6] had been put in the coefficient terms The average age presented in Table 1 is computer result and this is appropriate. Its only in the text that rounding up is usually made especially when offering explanations.