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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	First, the quantitative work is rather weak. Second, I hope you can express your thoughts more accurately.	
Minor 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.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is a case study, and it is an interesting study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Yang Weiwei**
Department, University & Country	**School of Economics and Management, Beijing University of Technology, China**