



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	The article is poorly supported by scientific data and doesn't achieve a review status for the issue treated. The way that it was written does not bring forward many novelties that have not been published in other papers or reports. A review should clearly show the objective and time of scope as well the database use to summarize the information, and should not only summarize the literature, but discuss it critically, identify methodological problems, and point out research gaps. Any of these basic issues were not performed. On the other hand, the structure of the text is coherent once, as it gives a general introduction on the context and, toward the end, a recapitulation of the main points covered, well as the subdivisions recommended for a review by the journal. The data not referenced on the context approached has many economic and social implications as even as conservation conflicts that could be misunderstanding and be used without any scientific criteria. There are a considerable data about the topic and I usually don't see any citation, for example for the section "legumes importance": "Legumes are	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	known to perform multiple functions. Grain legumes provide food (REFERENCE) and feed fertility (REFERENCE) and prevent land degradation (REFERENCE) improving crop and livestock productivity on a more sustainable basis (REFERENCE). Thus the adoption of such dual-purpose legumes, which enhance agricultural productivity while conserving the natural resource base, may be instrumental for achieving income and food security, and for reversing land degradation (Minale, 2011) . Many numbers in the “Background” part make the reading tiresome and difficult, this would better to be included in figures than cited on the text. Furthermore, “the background paragraphs “as a whole should be changed and highlight the basic concepts discussed along the review: pulses, importance of legumes and Ethiopia farming systems. I believe that the two first paragraphs don’t contribute to the scope of the paper in the way they were. One possibility would be to talk, at the beginning, about farming systems and them continues with pulses. Pulses is an important key word doesn’t considered. The key word “Sustainability “was not approached on the text and “agriculture” is redundant. It would be use one key word: “Ethiopian farming systems” instead of these words separated. Importance of legumes was oversimplified and not	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	well contextualized (see below some suggested literature on the topic). The importance of natives legumes as <i>Millettia ferruginea</i> and <i>Cordeauxia edulis</i> as well researches with legumes on Ethiopia, for example Ethiopia chickpea germplasm (Keneni <i>et al.</i> 2012/ Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems: 28(4) 338–349), was not considered. It will need bigger reformulations and to be rewritten. For the topics below I suggest a list of some papers that could improve the content value of the review: Background MacWilliam <i>et al.</i> 2014 (Agricultural Systems 123 ,43–53). Ebert , 2014 (Sustainability 6, 319-335). Importance of legumes Voisin <i>et al.</i> 2014 .(Agron. Sustain. Dev. 34:361–380). Ates <i>et al.</i> 2013. (Grass and Forage Science, 69, 17–31). Kassahun <i>et al.</i> 2009. (Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 129, 428–436). Keneni <i>et al.</i> 2005. (Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution (2005) 52: 551–561). Contribution of legumes to small l holder livelihood Baye <i>et al.</i> 2012 (Public Health Nutrition:	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	16(10), 1741–1750). Yusuf <i>et al.</i> 2014 (Fauna & Flora International, Oryx, 47(1), 54–58). Asfaw <i>et al.</i> 2012 (Food Policy 37, 283–295) Bekalo <i>et al.</i> 2009. (Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine , 5:26) Farming system of legumes Nebiyu <i>et al.</i> 2014 (Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst 98:253–266). Hillocks & Maruthi 2012 (Euphytica 186:647–654). Tesfay & Tesfay 2013 (Trop Anim Health Prod (2013) 45:379–385). Girma & Korbu , 2012 (Plant Breeding 131, 231—236). Erkossa & Teklewold 2009. (Agricultural Sciences in China 8(3): 352-360). Importance of legumes to livestock feed Yeheyis <i>et al.</i> 2012.(Trop Anim Health Prod . 44:1255–1261). Nurfeta <i>et al.</i> 2009. (Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition 93 , 94–104). Importance of legumes to human health Rebello <i>et al.</i> 2014.(Obesity reviews 15, 392–407).	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The use units should be standardized, sometimes they are written out, sometimes abbreviated. The sentence building with numbers are confused and should be rewritten. References are not standardized as recommend in the author's instructions. For example position of the year of the paper and reference to web-resources .	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The title is appropriate, if all the text modifications were done. A selection of relevant figures to the reviewed topic (for example, about high diversity of food crops of Ethiopia, many of them typical for this country and are not known elsewhere) could be very helpful for the paper and valorize the review.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Brazil