



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_4521
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY AND DETERMINANTS OF ACHA (Digitaria exilis) PRODUCTION IN KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Explain "avoid being biased" in line 86. Technical efficiency is not measured by the mode of the truncated normal distribution (line 118). Explain better. Gross margin in line 153 is not per hectare – the RHS of the equation is not consistent with per hectare. Line 165 delete "error" Line 174, .4183 should be .0418. Table on page 8. (1) What are "G" and "M?" (2) What hypothesis is tested by likelihood ratio test? Line 196. With Cobb Douglas production funcgton, rational stage will never be reached. Line 201. What is gamma? Line 202. I do not believe that interpretation is correct. Table 3. How are those values computed? Line 248. Explain why with higher tech eff, tech change would be the source of productivity growth.	All comments noted. Corrections and clarifications are made in the manuscript. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		