



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 (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	A good attempt by the authors. However, the written report is somehow lacking, for instance, lines 14-17, 19-23, 40-51, 68-70, 82, 238, 242 have been poorly constructed or hard to follow. This paper should be passed to someone competent in the English Language for suggestions on how to make the reading of the paper easier.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andell Edwards
Department, University & Country	Animal Health, University of Trinidad and Tobago, Trinidad and Tobago