



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6747
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF PRODUCTION RELATIONSHIPS IN THE CAPTURE FISHERY OF THE MIDDLE CROSS RIVER BASIN: A STOCHASTIC FRONTIER APPROACH
Type of the Article	Full 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The idea behind the manuscript is good but formulas in lines 66 and 78 does not reflect the Cobb Douglas model and function. The author should either give direct references to theoretical sources dedicated to model itself, not applications, with similar formulas or give more familiar formulas	The log transformation of the traditional Cobb Douglas function is now properly written as required. The error term is split into two for the estimation of the stochastic frontier showing both the white noise and the technical inefficiency.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some questions on sampling procedure, described in the article. Parts of sentences marked with "" are citations from the manuscript. "The five LGAs in the middle Cross River Basin were used for the study". Is it a comprehensive sample?	It is a multistage sampling procedure starting with all five (5) LGAs. This is as followed by sampling of fishing villages/settlements as stage 1 and finally the fishermen as stage 2
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Lack of references describing theoretical and methodological foundations of the research.	References 5-15 in the article shows the theoretical and methodological framework for the study.