



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_3787
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Impact Assessment of Diversification of Crops in Ethiopia: A Case Study

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 7 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Need to be re-reviewed before publication This manuscript needs serious language revision in almost all sections. The methods section should state, clearly and in detail, what was actually observed, measured (and how different values/weights were assigned), how many people were interviewed (and from which social category). The rationale for each method should also be described. Any limitations of these methods should be clearly outlined. Right now, it is not clear what the author/researcher did, let alone for someone to replicate the research. There should be a "results" section that shows the specific data collected through each method in this research. Some of the data on the second table, for example, were not clearly collected by this research, as the Tana Flower Project was under construction during the research period. However, the reader has no way of knowing where these data came from. Distinction should be made between statements and generalizations based on data collected at the research site and those from the literature for	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	other sites. Furthermore, if information from other sites are used, similarities and differences between the sites (e.g., agro-ecology, plot size, etc.) need to be provided. Right now, everything is mixed up. As a result, some generalization and claims, made in this manuscript, cannot be objectively scrutinized. Having separate, methods, results and discussions sections may help the transformation of information more clearly. It is also important to make clear the rationale/evidence for forecasting future impacts when there are no actual data at hand. As it now stands, this manuscript would not provide any clear information to experts, let alone to policy makers. For more editorial comments and questions please see the attached PDF file.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer