

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_105472
Title of the Manuscript:	Assimilating the Responsible Factors for the Technical Efficiency of Organic Brown Sugar Production: 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.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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as it bring about the significance of brown sugar and how brown sugar can be obtained from sugar cane.</b></p> <p><b>Yes the title is suitable for the article</b></p> <p><b>Unfortunately, the abstract appears to vague and does not provide a detail summary of the study. The results obtained in the study was not captioned in the abstract. Productivity and inefficiency are not key words.</b></p> <p><b>Thestudy appears to be scientifically correct, if the conclusion can be re-written.</b></p> <p>Jondrow J, Lovell CAK, Materrow IS, and Schmidt P. On the Estimation of Technical Efficiency in the Stochastic Frontier Production Function Model. Journal of Econometrics. 1982,19: 233-238.</p> <p>Mendonça CR, Rodrigues RDS. and Zambiasi RC. Brown Sugar in Apple Jellies. Ciencia Rural. 2000, 30: 1053-1058.</p> <p>These 2 Journals look to old year 1982 &amp; 2002. These should be replaced with recent Journals.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are many typographical errors in the manuscript. The conclusion, discussion of results and abstract need to be re- written.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In section 2, 2.1, 2.1.1, all the equation numbering should be aligned. Figures in Table 5 should have uniform decimal places</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oyinlola Rukayat Obanla</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Arkansas, United States of America</b>