

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_121987
Title of the Manuscript:	New Approach in Stochastic Frontier Analysis Estimation for Addressing Joint Assumption Violation of Heteroscedasticity and Multicollinearity
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is quite valuable for scientific community via filling the dearth of literatures in the area of SFA methodological advancement. It clearly reveals how standard SFA fails to counter the violation of multicollinearity and heteroscedastic problems. The study brought new insight about Weighted Principal component analysis (WPCA) SFA estimator as a robust and efficient in handling multicollinearity and heteroscedastic problems simultaneously compared with other estimators.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is informative and SMART (suitable)</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Yes, it is sound. However, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Some background information should be added (briefly elaborate the extent of the problem addressed and rational of undertaking such study) ✚ Lastly, proper implication should be drawn. </p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, it is appropriate. However, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ It somehow lacks theoretical literature reviews about the standard SFA and its prevailing model assumptions. ✚ It also missed out other criteria for evaluation of the estimators like MAE and BIAS in results and discussion part. ✚ It is also necessary to support results in discussion part with previous empirical findings. ✚ It is also important to revisit some inconsistency in the discussion part comparing with values on the tables. </p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ The manuscript is original and unique. ✚ It clearly proposed holistic remedial measures for the identified gaps ✚ It is technically sound as it proposed holistic approach to the underlined challenges ✚ It is scientifically robust as it presents details of simulation procedure designed to rigorously validate the robustness and efficacy of the estimators 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The reference style is consistent. However, there is repeating of one citation in the same paragraph particularly in introduction part. Citations should be updated. There are missed citations from reference part.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Accepted with minor revision of the above stated comments</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Shumet Asefa Kibret
Department, University & Country	Mekdela Amba University, Ethiopia