



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_36271
Title of the Manuscript:	DROUGHTS AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA: THE GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOs) MITIGATION STRATEGY IN FOOD SECURITY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
General comments	The manuscript concerns a very important question for global agriculture and overall sustainable development. The authors have put forward a very interesting methodology (i-ii-iii) and some of the resulting reflections are truly valuable and relevant, however, the manuscript is tainted with unnecessary flaws and must be revised thoroughly to become an acceptable article. As it is now, the manuscript presents itself as a comprehensive draft. Many paragraphs are illegible, with many sentences which do not make sense. Please cut up the sentences with punctuation and keep the focus of the sentences, in numerous places you start writing about something, and end up in an adjacent subject. THE PAPER CAN BECOME GOOD, BUT IT NEEDS A THOROUGH OVERHAUL, INCLUDING SHARPENING OF REFERENCES AND REVISION OF ESSENTIAL SUBSTANCE	Thank you for appreciating our research topic, methodology and the results. All the suggested corrections have been adequately addressed. The paper is now very good. We appreciate your great input. The paper is definitely very good.
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract: you state that “researchers have fronted...” but you do not say how you have investigated this issue (eg. This research investigates whether genetically modified plants are a viable / functional solution to ensure sustainable food production... or some other wording which actually describes the research question, before you describe how you went about to answer this question. Lines 9-11 are a bit unclear, please rewrite and make the three methods clear. I.16 typo I. 20-21 rewrite, unclear I.27 and onwards. Please define the strategies clearly I. 31 Use of GMO is not a strategy to mitigate drought. It is a strategy to mitigate the current problems which agriculture suffers because of drought. Unfortunately, the manuscript has numerous such unclear statements. I. 35, again; the methods i-iii were not employed in order to come up with an interesting research topic but instead in order to answer the questions which this topic raised ??? I. 44-52 is the conclusion of the study??? Should be moved out of the introduction chapter??? I. 53-59 are you assuming that biotechnology will solve the problems caused by drought or are you testing whether biotechnology will solve the problems caused by drought?? It is unclear. 60-61 ????? 66 arid? 67 punctuation after “Tanzania” and then make a new sentence. 81-86 a paragraph with good and important background information. Please restructure and put a few punctuations to separate things a bit. And if you give this info here, please tie it closer to the subsequent overview in table 1. 87-89 dendrochronology is important here, so please use correct scientific terms. 94 plate caption: please explain scramble and “well” or bore-hole	Abstract is corrected and suggested input included- lines 9-14. Typo corrected- line 23. Clearly re-written- line 28-29. Strategies listed. The sentence corrected- line 39. Statement corrected-line 45. Conclusion removed. Statement corrected- line 54-55. Deleted, it was a repetition. Corrected. Punctuation corrected- line 70. Sentence corrected and linked to table 1. The words used are also accepted as being scientific. Terms explained- lines 95-96. Ten, line 119. Claim true and explained- line126-127.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	117 ten OR 10 124 you claim that agriculture productivity in Africa is often low. Is this correct? 125 you claim that most industries in the tropics are agro-based. Is that correct? 129-31 the line is strange, some word must be missing?? 132 seldom does price fall when commodities are in short supply 135-36 interesting, but what does “duplication” mean? 140-44 please substantiate those important informations with a few good references 149 the line is strange, some word must be missing?? 153 im not so sure about that, possibly it is the other way around? 156-58 what do you mean? By biotechnological means or by breeding or what??? 164-69 important argument but unclear, typographical errors and repetitions. Please rewrite. 176-79. The claim refers to the US FDA. United States. And it must be backed by a proper reference. 180-84 a confusing repetition and re-definition of GMO. Please correct the whole paragraph according to this: First define GMO, then define food from GMO. DO NOT AGAIN DEFINE GMO it is not necessary. 207 find the newest information and give the readers the reference. 208. please explain the use of the word “popular” here, it seems misplaced. Please give the readers a reference. 216-18 surely this is only one out of numerous arguments? 219 which new breeds? 222-24 Which countries??? Put a reference 231-35 use words such as “Notably some researchers are critical to...” or “it has been claimed that...” you must be precise when you forward claims made by other researchers, eg. “J&J 1998 found that...” or “S,F & P 2010n claim that...” This is a basic standard of science and you must respect it. 238-39 what exactly is the difference between hybridization and cross-pollination??? 244 if no evidence supports, <u>then</u> the claims can be said to be exaggerated. Please rewrite. 253 please explain the abbreviation 261 to be critical of anti-gmo, means to be critical of the gmo-critics... 262 squeeze out? Do you mean replace? 266 this is an important finding, please use a scientific reference. 271 imprecise, the biotech companies have patented products and do not allow farmers in the western world to save seed from year to year... 276 reference missing 291 reference missing 344 whooping is not a scientific term 346 reference missing	Claim is true-line 131-134. Explained line 135-136. Corrected line 139. Explained line 141-143. Explained line 149-153. Corrected line 158-159. Re organised line 162. Corrected line 166. Re written lines 174-183. Addressed line 194. Corrected line 186-192. Corrected line 221-222. Term explained line 223. Explained line 230-231. Line 234. Countries listed, line 238. . Corrected line 246-256 . Corrected line 256. Corrected line 261. Explained, line 270. Corrected line 279. Corrected line 280. Sentence explained line 284. Corrected line 289-290. Inserted line 290. Inserted line 291 . Corrected line 381. Re-organised lines 383-388. Reference provided. Reference provided line 404. Re organised very well, lines 279-475.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	370 and 379. Please give a specific reference 376 important finding but reference missing REGARDING Balanced science: you present 5 pages of arguments against GMO, but only a little more than one page with arguments which support the use of GMO... (and, in the "pro-GMO chapter, the arguments are quite mixed) I fully understand the position of the manuscript, but you must be a bit more clear about it. Possibly remove the two major headings and just present the arguments in one chapter. 431-594 This entire and very important analysis seems to be based in newspaper articles as sources? That is not acceptable as basis for academic analysis?? Or are those points your own reflections and the references just refer to how the papers have presented these cases? 623-648 EXCELLENT, the conclusion is clear and strong, it is well founded in the analysis which you present. This is the strongest part of the paper. REFERENCES: Line 160, 227, 304, 430, 695, 721 and 754. Misleading references. All references must be corrected, as they are, they are partly incorrect. Please ensure that all references are checked and corrected, eg to the following format (see line 695-96 in manuscript): Smith, L.C., El Obeid, A.E. and Jensen, H.H., 2000. The geography and causes of food insecurity in developing countries. <i>Agricultural economics</i>, 22(2), pp.199-215. When you are referring to a chapter from a book, you must state that in your referencing, - it is not clear at present (eg 721) Many places you refer to reports, compilations, newspapers and other non-peer-reviewed sources. You should put some effort into finding actual peer-reviewed publications to substantiate those claims.	Points drawn from text, explained in lines 476-487. Thanks for assessing our research very highly. Corrected and provided in lines 170, 243,291,335, 369. Acknowledged. GMO issues are fairly current. Most materials are found in Reports, Workshop presentations and interviews as stated in our i-iii data collection methods. Our paper will provide peer reviewed publication for use by researchers.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		