SDI Review Form 1.6

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**
Type of the Article	**Review 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** *(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	**This manuscript is informative and is needed in the literature. However, major revision is needed before doing so, as multiple grammatical and sentence structure problems exist. I would suggest that the authors obtain an objective editor proficient in English to correct the problems. Also, many redundancies abound.** **However, the major problem with this manuscript is the lack of references. Most of the statements made should or could be supported by a reference or even multiple references, especially in light of that this manuscript is meant to be a Review paper.** **Lastly, the paper could be strengthened by the use of more graphs, tables, plots, etc. For example, a pie graph could illustrate the types and production of the legumes grown in Ethiopia or a graph could be used showing how household incomes were affected by growing legumes over several years, etc.** **I do apologize for not having more specific comments, but somehow lost that draft when I saving the original. I do not have the time to go back and re-state every comment. However, that being said, I do look forward to an edited version of this manuscript due to its importance.**	

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Editor: I originally had this paper reviewed via several comments pointing out grammatical and sentence structure errors, etc., line by line for different sections. However, I now cannot find where the review was saved. As I do not have the time to put that much detail into a second review, I only added my general comments as the compulsory revisions.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**USA**