



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 (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	This study aims to understand the variables behind the technical efficiency of tomato producers in Upper Region (ICOUR) in the Kasena Nankana District of Northern Ghana. There is no novelty methodology applied and the focus is an application of a B&C procedure	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	The title is according to the analysis developed in the paper	
Introduction	The objective of the paper are not explicit in the introduction section, the last paragraph should include them	
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	NA	
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	The methodology used is a classical procedure. The authors require more consistency in the notation, for instance line 80 use "U" and line 85 "u", is the same? Line 81, write in parenthesis "in natural logarithm" Line 91, B&C 1992 is not in the reference list Line 100, I cannot see equation 1.1 Line 101, v-u in lower case, the authors need to be consistent wrt notation Line 109, constant is omitted Line 111, the authors write "v+u", but should be "v-u" Line 112, The dependent variable should be "u" and the error term is the same equation 5a and 5b, but is not the same, again authors need to be more precise with technical notation Page 5, a table with descriptive statistics for all variables should be included	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Thanks, but the dependent variable is the mean of U which we have now represented as m (see Coelli et al 1998; p.213 Corrected
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	Line 145, write the lower limit first (1-5 first) Line 149, the authors should use the parameters of the Cobb-Douglas production function and estimate the scale measure of the	Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	farms Line 185, the sex variable is not statistically significant and the authors assume that sex is relevant for improve the efficiency, I would like a more precise use of this result With the re-estimation of the model, the sex variable has been omitted Lines 188-190, the authors need to be more precise with the interpretation of TE results. For example, education is a relevant variable to improve the efficiency, but not necessarily more educated people is more efficiency because there is no numerical evidence in the TE results that compare this 2 groups. The authors can use these groups to analyse the statistical difference between groups. This has been deleted since with the re-estimation of the model the education variable was not significant. Page 9, table1 has very weird results. In a Cobb-Douglas production function all parameters of the production function can be read has partial input elasticity PIE, and the sum of all PIE reflect the scale return which can be less, equal or greater than 1, but in the paper this total is close to 10, result that from my point of view is unrealistic. I believe that authors have no applied the natural logarithm to all data. Corrected.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.5

Conclusion	Policy implication talks about FASDEP I and II, and this is the first time that appear in the paper. I suggest to re write the Policy implications more related to the main results of the paper more than the actual text. Corrected There is too much political analysis that can be avoided from the paper. Finally, conclusions are weak and poorly related to the paper, authors need more effort to conclude wrt results of the paper Corrected	
References		