SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJAEES_13231**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FOREIGN LAND DEALS IN AFRICA: IMPLICATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL TRADE**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• The paper is timely and pertinent. However, the data used in the paper must be updated. Most of the data used are 2008 while we are in last quarter of 2014. If possible case studies must be done to substantiate the generalization used in the article. • As the impact of the land eviction violation of human rights must be indicated as people are forcefully evicted from their land by the government. • There are incoherencies in the article. For instance, on page two first paragraph, the figures indicated are not consistent (2.4 million indicated as overall land acquired while 3.9 million + 1.2 million indicated for Sudan and Ethiopia). Such kind of sentence must be checked throughout the paper. • Organization of the paper must be reflected in the introduction including the methodology employed. • Policy recommendations must be reflected on how these countries get benefits from the existing arrangements like leveraging for greater development of the country. This can be done in relation to the outcomes from the econometric model analysis. • Comments are not	

	integrated in the final version.	
Minor REVISION comments	The article has editorial problems. In this regard, the author must reread and address accordingly especially line 24, 57, 295, 309 . There are missing references such as Braun and Meinzen-Dick, 2011, Nidhi, 2011, Annelies 2010, Moodie, 2011-the one in the reference has no year) • Comments are not integrated in the final version.	
Optional/General comments	The article can be revised for better influence.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Gedion Gamora**
Department, University & Country	**Erasmus University, Netherlands**