SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/AJEA/2451**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Relationships between farmers' environmental behaviors and water resource management: The case of Khuzestan Province, Iran**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	GENERAL 1) The general idea of this research is interesting and useful and I encourage the authors to improve the data analysis, its discussion and the manuscript quality. 2) The English quality is very poor and the writing care in drafting is not the most appropriate: Eg the repetition of a sentence in the Abstract/methodology. 3) The Abstract/methodology doesn't clarify the research methodology, the Abstract/results are just a vague and generically idea and the Abstract/conclusion "adding variables" disagrees with the paper content. 4) The paper does not clarify if it refers to "irrigation water" or "rural domestic water" or generically "rural water". I can deduce that it is mainly irrigation, but it should be explained. METHODOLOGY 5) The HBM model is not presented and explained in the Methodology chapter (except the reference to fig. 1, which mixes the research framework with the BHM model fluxes), particularly how it is applied. 6) Methodology chapter also should include a map with study case site and to present and explain the local problem that claims the research study. And a good idea is to present what it is expected from this research study. 7) The paper refers a "questionnaire" (line 127) but it is not presented. In my opinion is should be, to become understandable the results obtained.	**1) This case was revised in the paper.** **2) This case was revised in the paper. Paper was rewriting.** **3) This case was revised in the abstract, methodology, results and conclusion paper.** **4) This case was revised as follows in the paper aim and paper generally. Line 14. Page 1.** **5) This part was revised in the paper and added to study theoretical framework part. Line 68-93** **6) This case was revised in the paper. Line 99-129. Page 3-6.** **7) Some items the questionnaire was added to the end paper (appendix). Line 334-393. Page 10-11.** **8) This section was revised and added in the table 1. Line 116- page 4.** **9) This case was added in the reference. Line 441-442. Page 12.** **10) More result about questionnaire was added to paper. Line 131-308. Page 5-9.** **11) This was revised in the paper.** **12) This was revised in the paper. Line 261-308. Page 8-9.** **13) This was revised in the paper. Line 313-318. Page 9.** **14) This was revised in the paper. Line 313-332. Page 9.**

	8) The variables are presented in table 1 and its conceptual definition is explained. These variables should be numbered or a simple representation by an acronym, because it is very heavy to read the full name a lot of times in the text and in tables 2 to 4. But the major shortcoming is the lack of information about the levels of the different variables and its correspondence to the real meaning by the farmers, according the questionnaires. 9) There are not a bibliographic reference of the "Croanbach's Alpha coeficient" RESULTS 10) The paper doesn't present any result about the questionnaire, but only correlation parameters. 11) The phrases of lines 188 to 192 should be explained and discussed, because they are relevant results. 12) Fig. 2 caption should explain the numbers presented in the diagram. This figure become the fig.1 not necessary CONCLUSION 13) I did not find the "adding variables" in BHM that "made it more complex", according the conclusions in the Abstract. It is a very weak point of this proposal. 14) The final "recommendations" representing the research conclusions (lines 212 to 219) seems too much generics and obvious, without any quantification.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		