



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_18889
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of the agro-net technology on management and financial profitability of cabbage and pepper production systems in Benin
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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper should needs to be edited as many of the sentences are badly structured eg. Line 121 "It rather assess ..."; p4 line98 "Prior to profitability it". In addition there are a couple of colloquial terms such as " Its worth having a glance.." p4 line 82. Many of the references cited in the article are not included in the list of references eg. P4 line 94 "Adegbola 2004) and in some cases the dates do not correspond eg. Tiamiyou 2002 p 4 90 listed as 1995 line 482. I suggest that author leaves out the entire discussion beginning at line 102 about the differences between "technical efficiency, allocative efficacy, and economic productivity", given their failure to clearly make such distinction. In addition this discussion is not directly related to the study at hand. Related to the above the first paragraph on page 5 tries to make a distinction between financial profitability and economic profitability and is a bit confusing; especially in light of the fact that the method used is that of enterprise budgeting. If anything it would be better for the authors to discuss the difference between "accounting profit" and "economic profit" and between "partial budget" and "whole farm budget". Profit is simply the difference	Grammar errors have been corrected, and several badly structured sentences are removed or reformulated. All references cited in the text are now included in the list of references, after dates are verified and corrected. Correction is made as required. There was however a need to briefly introduce the concepts of production efficiency, productivity and profitability in order for the reader to understand why labor and capital productivity, and profit ratio are calculated later. We agree with this comment. Indeed, the paper does not discuss economic profitability. The section is now rewritten to bring about more coherence and clarity.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	between costs and revenue. Economic profit takes into consideration implicit and explicit costs while accounting profit focuses only on explicit cost. Investment analysis can be done either as a financial or economic analysis whereby the former focuses on the enterprise and the latter focuses on society but this discussion is irrelevant to the current study and the methodology used. In fact the methodology that should be considered for a study such as this is simply partial budgeting. Page 6 line 185 . Not sure I agree that insect nets should be classified as “<u>biological</u> pest control technology” why not simply a “non-chemical technology.” Page 7. Line 205. Revise sentence “Each of ...” Page 8. Lines 238 – 243 Consider elaborating on partial budget technique Page 8, line 254 Use subscripts in specifying the equation. Page 266. Line 267. Revise sentence “It was calculated...” Page 266 line 273. Substitute “Gross Revenue” for Gross Output” Page 266 line 273 Define “capital” Page 10. Line 300. The term “young-like” has no scientific meaning	We agree. Correction is made. Corrected. Done Done Done. Sentence was even deleted for reason of repetition. Done Done Corrected. The whole paragraph is rewritten to ensure more coherence.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 11. Line 345 refers to benefit/cost ratio but in the Table 4 the calculation is in terms of Cost/benefit ratio.	Figures in Table 4 are well benefit/cost ratio. The required correction is made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is interesting and certainly helps to demonstrate the need to ensure that recommended technology/practices are relevant and cost effective.	Thanks!