



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6493
Title of the Manuscript:	Competitiveness'sDeterminants in the Avocado Export Sector'sValue Chain
Type of the 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 manuscript aims at determining the extent of innovation and knowledge for the competitive advantage of the links in the value chain avocado exporters in Uruapan, Michoacan. It has originality. But, there are some points should be improved. Below I include some remarks, which should be taken into account while preparing a better version of the paper. My overall judgment is that the paper should be improved and resubmitted to <i>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</i>. (1) The process of the analysis should be explained more clearly. Not only the concepts. (2) The abstract should be improved. (3) The Introduction section should be improved and more related works should be introduced. (4) Why the meaning of Section 2.1, Para. 1? (5) Table 3 should be explained more clearly. For example, why the 0.962, 0.942, 0.920 were choose? Not others? (6) Fig. 4 should be explained further. (7) The difference of the Tables 4 and 5 should be explained and the reason should be pointed out. (8) References: Some recent related works should be added.	I agree with each of the points that the Reviewer suggests to modify the Manuscript. We prepared a better version of the manuscript, based on comments from Reviewers: • We explained more clearly the process of article based on not only theoretical concepts. • The abstract was improved. • The introducing substantially improved. • We explain each of the tables and figures of the article. And updated the references used.
Minor REVISION comments	The paper should be carefully proofread and some spelling mistakes should be corrected.	The paper carefully corrected each mistakes were found.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Summarizing, my overall judgment is that the paper should be improved a lot and resubmitted to <i>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</i> .	The manuscript was improved, based on the Reviewer's comment, following each of your suggestions and using the SDI paper template.
---	--	--