



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2012/AJEA/1448
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY OF RICE PRODUCTION AT THE TONO IRRIGATION SCHEME IN NORTHERN GHANA</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM

PART B:

For comments of Reviewer 1 and author's feed back	FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
	Sec.1.1: Why are the map and the technical details so important? I did not find any spatial analysis related to position of rice pads or the relation of technical efficiency. It is not related to topic or questions explored. The study is focusing on socio-economic indicators and farming practises. Consider removing all the dam related issues. Sec.2.1: Remove references to firms, used farmers or farms instead. Be precise in stating of the model. There should be TE_i as it is the farm i efficiency. Also, Z is not defined. The choice of the functional form does not cause multicollinearity. They may show up but are not caused. Sec.2.4: Without comparing the population and farmers average age the reader can not find the support for "youthful". Considering the variance of data in Tab.1, the two decimal number precision is meaningless. Sec.3.1: Has to be rewritten. It is not clear what the hypotheses mean as elements of sums are not mentioned before this table. Use the names from text. Sec.3.2: In sec.3.1. the translog specification is rejected, so why it is important to report in Table 3? Increasing the amount of land or fertiliser is not a long-run effect. Long-run relates to time not quantity. The analysis of cross ratios in estimation raises lot of questions. What can drive the substitutability in case of expenditures and its relation to labour and fertiliser? Table 3 is messy, and does provide the test of function form. Sec.3.3: I would suggest histogram or distribution estimate instead of table for distribution. Sec.3.4: How are the categories for experience and size chosen? It is just ad hoc? The distribution or histograms will be more informative. The line 385 state that gender is important for efficiency but the difference with respect to sex on average is just 1%? Is it significant difference? Line 393 claims that irrigation is must be extended? Irrigation is not a scope of the dataset used. There is no link between the efficiency scores (production function) and irrigation. It is not related to data used. Sec.4: The conclusion of the high efficiency is related to irrigation. There is no comparison with nonirrigated farms.	
For comments of Reviewer 2 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 3 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 4 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 5 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 6 and author's feed back		



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM

PART C: FINAL Recommendation:

Accept As It Is:	No. The revision in methodology part and use of the econometric should be subject to major upgrade.
Requires Minor Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	Yes. I hoped for major improvements after commenting on the used method and the critique on drawing the results. Authors should be much more careful when interpreting the results. This paper needs much of proof reading. However, there is a lot of formal gaps.
Rejected:	It may be considered, as the revised version did not deliver significant improvements in clarity and results description.
Submit to Another Journal o SDI (name the journal)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	František Brázdík
Affiliation:	Czech National Bank, Czech Republic