

Editor's Comments:

I read very carefully the paper, the reviewers' comments and the revised paper and the changes proposed by the reviewers have been done by the authors. However, there is a very important issue that must be solved; otherwise the paper must be rejected.

In the page 2 (lines 51-74) authors use a part of the text authored by Kumar et al. (<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/109516/2/18-Anjani-Kumar.pdf>) and word by word. The text must be inserted into quotation marks, otherwise is a plagiarism.

Moreover, the reference Elizabeth et al., 2000 must be written in the following way: (Elizabeth et al., 2000 in Kumar et al., 2011). of course, authors should limit this text taken by Kumar et al. - it's a matter of respect of authorship. Of course the right name is Kumar et al. and not Anjani et al., as the authors write.

In the page 3, lines 83-98 have been taken by the original text of Kuma, 2012 (page 17) (<http://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/24943/BerhanuKuma-Thesis-DairyValueChainEth.pdf?sequence=1>). The use of literature written by another author previously constitutes plagiarism, so the authors have two choices:

1. to delete the text or
2. to write in each parenthesis "in Kuma, 2012".

Author Feedback :

We appreciate your thorough approach towards our article. The identified lapses have been corrected. Attached are the revised paper and the editorial comments