



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12412
Title of the Manuscript:	The Prospects of Brown Cane Sugar–Cattle Integration for Rural Economic Development in South Sulawesi, Indonesia
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 <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	The manuscript needs a serious review on English language (spelling and grammar); There are many sentences without spaces among words and many sentences unintelligible. The research method needs a better description. Many data described on text have no reference, which leads the reader to think that they were obtained by the authors.	Some data has been revised and added with sources as reference
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some sentences and paragraphs that are repetitions from previous sentences and paragraphs. Some units used are not in SI, like "quintals" (line 179). I also suggest the authors convert the Rp into US\$ (USD). Table 1 has no date on the source.	Quintal as an unit was wrong and it has been change into tones. It is difficult for me to convert from Rp (IDR) into US \$. Because I want to also inform the Indonesian currency to the word community. I proposed to put note, the Exchange Rate is Rp 11,000/\$US in 2013. Therefore, I request to the editor to put if necessary.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some references should be avoided. (Wikipedia and papers presented at symposiums). The paper brings an important issue. The proposed idea may help develop an entire region.	Wikipedia and symposium has been replaced by other sources.