



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5481
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affecting the adoption and intensity of use of improved forages in north east highlands of Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	You need to be very careful in reporting your model results. On Page 17, lines 402-403, you state that market access is an important variable for adoption of technologies, but distance to market isn't significant. If it's not significant, then you have little evidence to suggest there's any relationship. Then, on lines 404-405, you stated that distance to roads impacted both adoption and intensity of adoption, but according to Table 5 results, it impacted only intensity of adoption. Please look through your results and clear up these issues throughout.	I have corrected based on the comment. This was an error in reporting results from the model.
Minor REVISION comments	You provide a lot of information on Ethiopian agriculture on the first few pages. Some of this information is helpful, but some seems extraneous to the paper. You might go through this section and delete information that's not directly relevant to the subject of your paper. Do you have more information on the oat, vetch, and trilucern improved technologies that you can tell us about? What constitutes an improved technology for each of these? In your results, you often say that, "the result is consistent with (authors)." This needs to be developed somewhat. For instance, on Page 16, lines 363-364, how are your results consistent with Abay & Assefa and Teklewold et al., who did not study forages? I think I know the answer – that they found similar signs for other	I have deleted few of the information. I have added some information I have tried to justify such information



SDI Review Form 1.6

	technologies – but you need to spell that out. Just saying they're consistent isn't very informative. The same needs to be done elsewhere. Overall, the writing is pretty good. There are a number of places where there are minor technical edits that will need to be made, so you might find a technical editor to help with those.	I agree with the review and have revised in that regard. I have done that job.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	