

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_96249
Title of the Manuscript:	Allocative Efficiency in Rainfed Maize Production System by Small-Scale Farmers in Central Agricultural Zone of Cross River State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original 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:

<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes! It implies practical application of scientific strategic implementation of suitable means in gaining profit out of inputs utilized for maize production.</b>  <b>Minor variation can make it suitable by shifting <b>Efficiency</b> and <b>Allocative</b> follows.</b>  <b>Yes! It gave overview of the whole Article content.</b>  <b>Sections are appropriate but lack number, while subsections are completely not included.</b>  <b>Analysis in the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>  <b>It is a short research Article with enough references correctly written with sequentially numbering.</b>  <b>Obviously methodological statement commonly side-line materials, that is how the Article reading reflect.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language is good and properly expressed.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Meaning of Tables content are challenging and educative.	

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Makkies David Lengwati
Department, University & Country	South Africa