



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_6599
Title of the Manuscript:	"Factors affecting technical efficiency of small-holder coffee farming in the Krong Ana Watershed, Vietnam"
Type of the Article	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>)



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	• Expound on methodology indicating the research design, sampling procedure and sample size, data and variables. The author has alluded to the sampling method used in the end notes, but would be preferred if there is explicit discussion on methods for ease of replication. • Explain the data provided under results. For example, if age is significant, what does it mean? The older the farmer the less the production? If technical efficiency is 0.7466, what does that mean? Is it a well or poorly functioning farm? etc	We expanded the methodology section as suggested by the reviewer. The proportion of coffee planted area of the four districts has also been added. Discussion has been expanded in the methodology section. The end notes have been deleted and relevant information incorporated in the text. Also, we have rearranged the structure based on the template as required. The age of household head was not a statistically significant factor affecting efficiency of coffee production as highlighted in yellow in section 3.3. In order to limit the number of pages, we avoided lengthy discussion on this. We have provided further interpretation for the mean of technical efficiency for both regions (highlighted in yellow in section 3.3). As suggested, we have separated and revised



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Section 4.2 is excellent. However, the first focus should have been around coffee production and effect of various factors on yield as derived from the production frontier, and how these vary by location. The second part on cost of inputs would then flow smoothly. Also try to explain how input variability was measured (section 4.2, line 5). • Under section 4.3, information is missing on technical efficiency and yet this is the first objective. Please provide the data and explain the data. Some of the data that would go under this section seem to be captured in section 4.3. Review please. • If possible separate discussion from results. For section 4.4 results and discussion are combined, while sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, its only results and no discussion. Need to be consistent on presentation.	this section to present how various factors affect yield and the effect of cost of inputs (see section 3.2) The result of Chow test suggests that we should treat the data set in 2 separate production frontier models. Due to input variability, variables such as organic fertilizer, inorganic fertilizer and pesticides, were measured in monetary value. We have included a separate table (Table 3) which provides more information about technical efficiency. In the text, we have revised the term technical inefficiency to be technical efficiency for consistency. We have revised the conclusion and recommendations section accordingly. Section 4.4 is the major part of the paper. We have changed the titles of section 4 and 4.4 as suggested.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Need to make conclusions based on research questions / objectives	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Section 2.2. The title indicates factors affecting technical inefficiency. Please adjust this to ‘factors affecting technical efficiency’, since the discussion seems to hinge more on technical efficiency as opposed to the former. • Section 2.2, paragraph 3, the author refers to ethnicity as a factor in coffee production. However, the explanation is more on resource constraints/endowment. Needs review to give a right picture. • Include end notes for only those issues which cannot be explained in text and cannot be referenced • Need for consistency in the use of ‘and’ and ‘&’, especially on references in text • Need for consistency in the referencing style – Surname, Initials, and year. Also for journal papers – Volume (No.): pages. Not consistent in some cases. • Again need to review the flow and coherence of the paper.	We have revised the title as suggested. We agree with the reviewer and have deleted irrelevant information from the text. We have deleted end-notes and included the information in relevant areas of the text We have revised this for consistency. We have revised the reference style according to the journal format
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The author can explain the rationale for the choice of model, also indicate why the log model • Clearly indicate in the Table 1 the independent variables, explanatory variables and the hypothesized effect of the explanatory variables on the dependent variable • Would be preferred if results are presented by objective	We have included the rationale for selecting the logarithmic model in section 2.3. We have deleted table 1 to shorten the length of the paper. Relevant information is incorporated in the text (section 2.3). We agree with this suggestion. However, given the present concern about manuscript length,, we decided to keep the results in their current format. For consistency, we have used the term technical efficiency throughout the paper and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• • Technical efficiency and inefficiency are used interchangeably throughout the paper. Need clarity on what the message is. • Am not sure about the author's use of ethnicity to explain technical efficiency. I would rather the author uses location as this is explainable by biophysical, socio-economic and differences in agronomic practices.	revised any discussion previously referring to technical inefficiency. We agree with the alternative suggestion on this issue. Given literature related to technical efficiency and ethnicity and also considering the different ethnic groups residing in the Krong Ana watershed, we decided to include this factor in the study.
--	--	---