



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/1447
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY OF TOMATO PRODUCTION: THE CASE OF IRRIGATION COMPANY OF UPPER REGION (ICOUR) IN THE KASENA NANKANA DISTRICT OF NORTHERN GHANA</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)</i>
General comment:	It can published after major revisions.	
Specific comments:	• This study carried out on 2007-2008 which cannot be authentic for now (2012) because many conditions may be changed. • There are some grammatical errors and bad vocabulary selected in different places of the manuscript which is better to change (some of them highlighted). • In line No. 119 has been said that some variables have been excluded due to low significantly, how this result obtained? • In Results section I cannot see any equation made for cob Douglas model. •	Not necessarily so in Ghana. In Ghana socio economic indicators do not change shortly like that Corrected to the best of our ability The model has been re-estimated using all the conventional inputs as well as their physical quantities. We did not mean to state the Cobb-Douglas production function, but just to say that we were using its specification
Title and abstract	Title is too long and can be shorter.	Corrected
Introduction	It can be shorter.	Unfortunately because other reviewers wanted more information with respect to the economic, climatic, vegetation and soil indicators this could not be shortened.
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Ok.	Thanks!
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	• In this manuscript the method of cross sectional is used, but I could not understand what this is! • The kind of input data of Cobb-Douglas model cannot identified for readers. For example what mean transplanting or bed preparation? Are there dummy variables or quantified?	We interviewed different farmers in the study area within the same year that is why it is a cross-sectional study. The variable list has been revised for re-estimation.



SDI Review Form 1.5

	- It is better that a table made for introducing input variables including type of data, mean, max and min, average and etc. - Corrected	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	It has been said that using modern inputs caused high efficiency in Ghanaian farms, but there is not any explanation for introducing modern inputs to readers. Corrected	
Conclusion	This manuscript tried to study efficiency in tomato farms, but in conclusion section issues mentioned which have not considered in study. The conclusion has been subsumed under the discussion and it's no longer necessary.	
References	Ok.	