

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_99717
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Technical Efficiency of Rice Production in Radhi Gewog, Trashigang District, Bhutan: A Stochastic Frontier Approach
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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 REVISION</b> 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>	1. Has the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used been tested? 2. Based on table 3 rice seed and Fertilizer are not significant, justification related to this. Isn't it that in every statistical analysis the use of alpha must be the same??? 3. Table 3 is the same as Table 4, it is better if only one is presented because the data is not different. 4. Is there a research ethics in this research? 5. We recommend that the literature used for at least the last 5 years is primarily the result of research.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Rudy Hartono
Department, University & Country	Makassar of Health Polytechnic, Indonesia