

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_99904
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic and Technical Efficiency of Maize Production in the Eastern District of Bhutan: 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:

<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, as it aims to analyze the efficiency of agricultural crops -- specifically with regard to the Maize crop. A Stochastic Frontier is estimated using exactly one output (maize yield per acre) and multiple inputs (land area, labor, fertilizer, etc.). The efficiencies are calculated, per farm, approximately in inverse proportion to the distances to the frontier. In a second phase, the sources of inefficiencies are identified, among which the age and experience of the farmer, as well as the size of the farm stand out. Its conclusions can guide public policies to stimulate maize production, especially if the objective is to increase productivity.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is apt in my perception.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is understandable. However, the sentence "<i>Results show that maize producing farmers are 81.47 percent technically efficient and 78.19 percent economically efficient in producing maize...</i>" should be written to better explain what is meant. Are the authors referring to the average efficiencies of farmers?</p> <p>4. Yes, I agree with the organization of the sections.</p> <p>5. Although I consider the manuscript to be scientifically sound, I have a few questions for the authors. They are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the last equation in Section 2.2 correct? Please review. The notations are also duplicated. The parameters of this equation should not be the same as the first equation of that Section. What is $Lnsig2v$? (see Table 2). I found no explanation of the conceptual differences between technical efficiency and economic efficiency. Regarding the Technical Inefficiency Component, it would be interesting to discuss the effect of Education and Training, as well as the fact that the associated coefficients are not significant. <p>6. Yes, I consider the bibliography appropriate and I have no additional suggestions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The writing of the article has adequate quality. However, I do have a few observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please review: Economic and Technical Efficiency (title) vs Economics and Technical Efficiency(abstract) Sentence "If Y_i/Y^* then, $TE_i = 1$ implying 100% efficient" in the third paragraph of Section 2.2. should be rewritten. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilson Calmon Almeida dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, Fluminense Federal University, Brazil