



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6701
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF RICE AS FOOD AND INCOME SECURITY CROP IN PUTI-PUTI SUB COUNTY, PALLISA DISTRICT, UGANDA
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	Line 25-26: "Globally, ..." This statement needs to be referenced. Line 37, 167, 174 vs. line 244 Ocholla et al., is spelled differently from what is given in the REFERENCES section (Ochollah,...). Line 38: Reference is not listed in the REFERENCES section. Line 48-50: "According..." Statement is repeat of what was mention previously (line 38-39). Line 52: Reference is not listed in the REFERENCES section Line 90, 106 -107: The term "sales of food crops" can be ambiguous because can also imply cash crops (that is also crops grown for sale). To prevent confusion differentiation between the two by using the terms commercial crop vs. cash crops Line 93: The author mentions that rice is " feature more prominently as both <u>food</u> and" This is confusing. According to Table 1, 2 and the statement in line 94: it has the highest output hence less available (12% + 26%) for consumption as food. Also, the availability of the other crops listed in Table 2 seems higher and suggest more availability as food. What is clear is according to the	The relevant references have been provided. In fact, additional information has been included as highlighted The right name has been used. It is Ochollah not Ocholah as highlighted in the text The citation is included in the reference list This information has been addressed The citation is included in the reference lists In the context used, these are traditionally food crops but can be sold to get some money to cater for other needs whereas what is referred to as cash crops were grown specifically for sales but not food. Although, now there is a shift where the traditionally food crops are now being sold for money but still eaten. This is based on table 6 not tables 1 &2. Line 94 is basically, the production compared to other crops and total



SDI Review Form 1.6

	results in table 1 and 2 is that rice features as a major cash crop only. Please resolve this statement. Line 158: Reference UBOS not listed in REFERENCE section. Line 168: Reference Bigirwa not listed in REFERENCE section. Line 177: Reference Sserunkuuma not listed in REFERENCE section. Line 158 – 159; 165-167 and 177-179: The sentences concerned with rice as a cash crop / food or staple subsistent /contributing to food security etc. in Uganda, are a repeat of what were already mentioned in the introduction and adds no further insight.	production that is sold as either food or cash crop. However, what is clear is that the proceedings from other crops are higher. The citation is included in the reference lists This has been included in the reference list This has been substituted by a better citation---Hyuha et al. 2005 The citation has been included in the reference list. This has been revisited
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In some places sub-county is written as sub county – pleas be consistent with this term as sub-county. Line 87, 91, 95: Too many sentences’ beginning with “However” Line 130: “advanced” is not the right term here, please considered using “given”, “provided” etc.	The suggestion sub-county has been adopted throughout the text The revision has been effected as highlighted in the text The word given was used to replace advanced as highlighted in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The DISCUSSION sections need attention due to the repeat of certain concepts already stated in the INTROUCTION. Therefore this section is limited and weak. Considered rewriting this section more clearly and expand a little more on the other results obtained during this study and perhaps other similar studies in Uganda or elsewhere. Many references were not listed	The discussion has been re-written to avoid a repeat of has been included in the introduction but where necessary relevant evidences were cited as back up All the citations has been included in the reference list