



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_18966
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Adoption of Improved Highland Forage Type: Evidence from Dendi District, West Shoa Zone, Ethiopia
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	First, the quantitative work is rather weak. Second, I hope you can express your thoughts more accurately.	OK
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Line 32: Forages, should be forages; -Line 42: NGOs, should be NGOs; -Line 44 & Line 46: Lack of adequate seed availability, should be lack of adequate seed availability; -Line 55: Land shortage, should be land shortage.	OK
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is a case study, and it is an interesting study.	OK