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	

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	**Authors'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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract: "Findings show that labour and credit were the most important variables". Important for what? Line 44-51: The reason why technical efficiency should be assessed has not been documented/justified. The foregoing doesn't offer appropriate justification of the study. Line 64: Explain why the double log (Cobb Douglas) specification was adopted for the fish firms Line 78: Formulae not properly written. Subscripts should be well written. Some ending brackets are also missing in the right hand of the formulae. Line 96: the writing of formula is not clear. New elements not referred to before are introduced and cannot be easily linked with previous lines. Line 100: the formulae of Zcal assumes samples are independent during rainy and dry season. How can this be ascertained if sampling is done in the same community of fishermen during the two seasons? I would suggest that Zcal which considers non independent samples be rather used. Line 127: What were the criteria used to choose the two villages in each LGA? Who set them? The researcher first with validation later by community leaders, or directly by the latters without prior indication by the researcher? This is critical for development policy issues, which would draw on the findings of this study. The rationale behind purposive sampling is critical for policy decisions. Line 188-196: Enough explanation is not provided on the reason why credit was not significant in explaining fish	

	catches' variation during the dry season. Obviously, if fish catches are low and quite constant during the dry season, fishermen would not require credit to sustain their production activities. Line 201-204: Although the authors indicated the technical differences between the two seasons, more explanation should be provided on how the increasing number of migrant fishermen contributes to the diminishing returns to scale. Line 231: "The contact with extension is not significant". This is true only for the aggregate and rainy season models, which is understandable. Indeed, extension agents wouldn't waste their time offering advices in the rainy season were fish catches are low (low activity level of a few fishermen). On the contrary, contact with extension is highly significant (1% level) during the dry season (Table 3). Authors should highlight this critical finding, as far as government support to fish farms is concerned. Line 249-250: Why was education not significant during the dry season? Authors should explain. It is peak season when all sorts of fishermen (including opportunistic migrants) invade the beaches. It is quite obvious that education would not make any particular difference at that time. Only physical capacity and experience of fishermen will pay then.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	In the abstract, mean technical efficiency and the range should be expressed in the same format (decimal or percentage. Not both) Authors should reformulate in good English the sentences in line 24-27. Line 35-36: Not all fish species have the property of solving heart problems. Authors should indicate the species concerned, or reformulate the sentence. Line 36-37: source should be cited. Line 39: the sentence is a conclusion which cannot be made from previous sentences. Line 44-45: sentences to be reformulated, and punctuation to be properly made. Line 46: The use of "however" is not appropriate Line 53: Choose between "Literature review" or "Theoretical framework". The text here is too short to be a literature review. Line 61-63: Strange way of citing authors. Sentences should be reformulated.	u
Optional/General comments	This is a good paper, which followed concise methodology and offer findings that are well convincing. However, authors should go deeper in some explanations and link them with development policy issues. English writing should be also improved at many places.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barthelemy G. Honfoga
Department, University & Country	Department of agricultural economics and rural development communication, University of Abomey-Calavi, Republic of Benin