



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27930
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES ON PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF WHITE LUPIN (<i>Lupinus albus</i> L.) IN ETHIOPIA: A STRATEGIC ORPHAN CROP
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Manuscript concerns an important problem related with the assessment of the potentials, production and utilization of white lupin in Ethiopia. A sample size of 80 respondents for the two districts was used in this study. Abstract is clear, informative, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. In "Introduction" are cited 7 authors. The methods used are accurate and correctly described. So described they allow experiment to be reproduced. Appropriate statistics was used. The experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author (-s) compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance of the crop studied. In Discussion are used 27 authors.	Thanks,
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	However, some errors were noted: In "Discussion" Authors [4], [5] and [7] and other have already cited in section "Introduction". Authors [4] and [8] are repeated many times. Tables and figures must be presented according authors guideline. I think that some tables can be united.	Authors (4) and (8) addressed different aspects of white lupin in their work and hence cited repeatedly for related issues in the manuscript. Authors (5) and (7) also addressed on post harvest and therapeutic values of white lupin used in different areas and hence cited for repeatedly for related aspects in different parts of this manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line s 72 and 81 is omitted to write a references Lines 484 [21] and 486 [22] are missing in the text. Table 8 and figure 8 also are missing in the text. In "Conclusion" paragraph from Line 391 to line 396 must be corrected. It is similar to texts in part "Introduction" (lines 38; 50; 54 and 55.	Tables and figures are rearranged/placed in the text according to the guideline. References [21]& [22] are included in lines 347 & 348rspectively ; edited. Line 391 is edited as "White lupin (<i>Lupinus albus</i> L.) is member of the genus <i>Lupinus</i> in legume crops. In Ethiopia, it is locally known as <i>Gibto</i> and is adapted to 1500-3000 m.a.s.l. It is being produced mainly by subsistent farmers. The crop has multipurpose benefits such as, nutritional value as food and feed, therapeutic values and soil fertility maintenance." Table 8 edited & is included in line 416 (tables7-9); (figure 8) cited in line 371.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style. The proposed peer review manuscript, titled "Challenges on production and utilization of white lupin (<i>Lupinus albus</i> L.) in Ethiopia: A strategic orphan crop" is of interest.	Thanks,