



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11253
Title of the Manuscript:	The importance of Legumes in the Ethiopian Farming system and Overall Economy: Overview

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The author has made significant revisions. Yet, the paper has some limitations. Example ➤ The author claimed in his feedback that he/she has included <i>experimental results, not opinions</i>, even though his/her work is a review, which requires creating a generalizable argument based on data of others' work; and in this respect, there is a limitation ➤ Nearly 50% of references are reports from one source [Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (ECSA)] which could limit comprehensiveness of the paper ➤ Despite such limitations and also limitations on some of points of argument, the paper may be published	Thank for the comments, As far as comparison of legumes and cereals are concerned, still I don't see problems and you can get lots of comparison reports considering different scenarios of the two groups. But, you are right in way that both the advantages and disadvantages of both groups should be mentioned while comparing the two. For example, I mentioned that legumes are very low yielders than cereals in terms of grain production. However, they are by far better than cereals with respect to nutrition. I did not say they are complete and substitute others. I included experimental data comparing the two groups in economic terms. I wanted to explain that I don't have any intention/interest to foster one over the other, but to report the fact underlying the two groups considering different aspects like, productivity, farming system importance, economic importance and others. What makes this irrational? and mentioned as limitation of the paper! Regarding the reference, that source is used mainly to include production data in long time series as suggested by one of the reviewer otherwise other parameters/information have been referred from difference sources included in the manuscript both in the text and reference list