



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_31883
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) value chain in Dilla Zuriya District, Dilla Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	<p>The paper has good topic but the structure and sections need more works and improvements. The topic of Mango value chain sounds important in Dilla Ethiopia and for African countries but author (s) have weak justifications in this review paper and even the theoretical gaps were not clear. The whole paper needs restructuring (for example, it sounds more industrial review and very skipped review), Introduction (this section is very short and needs better story line) literature review (the section of literature is missed and better to be included), industrial context (this section is not highlighted as main heading and better to justify it in a better way), underpinning methodology (the section of research method needs better justification and explain things in detail (half page for example about method, sampling even it was secondary data) and results (are quite good and the qualitative analysis is good but they miss valuable structure or story line).</p> <p>Comments to the Author The topic of the article is interesting as well as the empirical application to Ethiopia. However, the current version of this paper needs improvements, as follows:</p> <p><u>Abstract:</u> The abstract is meaningful, but the authors need to (better) describe the objectives by clarify more the stages (develop and investigate) including the empirical context, the methods used, the main contribution and originality and their implications. The authors need to avoid including many technical concepts in the abstract and include more theoretical concepts.</p> <p><u>Introduction:</u> The authors need to (better) emphasize which are the contributions of this research with regard to previous studies. A better justification of why Africa and then particularly why Dilla Ethiopia have been</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your constructive comments for my manuscript . I edit based on the comments.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

selected as the context for conducting this research is important. A brief description with official sources regarding Ethiopia industries' trends in the target markets, main markets, culture issues and etc.. . the area of study is not supported with a story line. At the end of the introduction, it is better to provide the reader with a summary (which you have it at the end) about what are the next sections in a new paragraph.

I suggest also to make the Introduction section a page and half with better organizing and I suggest to remove the subsections in the introduction as you will have better display for the topic.

Conceptual Background and Literature Review:

The authors could be better first introduce the topic in general then provide the main topics in the literature review (THIS IS MISSED PART IN THE PAPER). The literature review analyzes value chains, poor people, finance, export marketing and management capabilities including chain actors, farming system and mango performance. Therefore, what is the relation with value chain? The authors may help the reader with better understanding for the two concept of value chain: from the each actor perspective and if there is any difference. The authors could also discuss briefly why external and internal factors are important for this study.

Most of the references are not very new and the recent literature is also missing; at least 5 new articles 20015-2016 should be used. The support from previous studies are still weak, for example, I suggest to have a table which shows the development history of researchers (previous studies on the topic of this study). This simple table can have a summary for 10 used articles or review papers (old –new)with focusing on the concepts used in the paper,type of method, main results.

Research Method:

The methodology is very weak !! The type of methods should be better introduced in the research method section. The parts of this section need better introducing and explanation. What were the type of method; qualitative , secondary data, and sample or source frame? What are the number of documents you used? When did you collect the data? How did you manage to contact the officers; was the email the best way, how many officers and what was the respond percentage?!. It seems that the sample was two types but what are the criteria for each group and why we have your personal experience involved!!. It seems that the authors have missed a table on the classifications for the documents and information and also demographic analysis for the officer sample. It is not clear if the data



SDI Review Form 1.6

collection was based on personal interviews or other ways.

I suggest to put Value Chain Analysis (VCA) as a tool of analysis in the methodology and the steps you need to use for quantitative analysis or qualitative analysis. See, for example, FAO VCA or UNIDO VCA. Why you do not provide the main themes and their measurements in this section as a guideline for analysis in a table; for example

Theme	Measurements
1. The stakeholders (or Actors)	are the
2. External factors	are the
3. Etc.	

Analysis and Findings :

I suggest to change section 3 to be Analysis and Findings. The review should be organized and displayed in more better ways. For example quantitative analysis section should be moved to be part of the the product flow. Another example qualitative analysis and quality management should be part of internal factors

- 3.1 Actors of Mango value chain
- 3.2 Map of Mango value chain
- 3.3 Product and information flow
- 3.4 Internal and external factors

The maps are great ! however the offered tables need better presentation (if applicable). The discussion could enhance this section by relating the results with the current state of Ethiopia.

Communication:

Overall enhancement for the readability of the article is required. The references need to be fixed better based on the Journal conditions. I believe that the authors used unranked sources of references and this weakness the paper so I suggest to use some new and ranked articles.

English need a native proof reader.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	N/A	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	N/A	