ECONOMICS -

THE OPEN-ACCESS, OPEN-ASSESSMENT E-JOURNAL

Reviewers Guide

PART A: Editorial Office Only

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	Dr. Gbadebo Odularu	
E-Mail:	godularu@fara-africa.org	
Discussion Paper Number:	2013-17	
Title:	"US Food Security and Climate Change: Agricultural Futures".	
Authors:	Eugene S. Takle, David Gustafson, Roger Beachy, Gerald C. Nelson, Daniel Mason-D'Croz, and Amanda Palazzo	

PART B: Reviewer Only

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	 The United States appears to be one the major contributors to greenhouse gases emissions in its attempt to foster economic development. It is crucial to note that quite a number of the developed countries achieved tremendous economic growth at the expense of the environment. The definition of food security in most of these articles on 'Food Security and Climate Change: Agricultural Futures' seems to be one-sided. Climate change impacts on about four (not only productivity) dimensions of food security. It impacts on (i) food availability (ii) food accessibility (iii) food utilization (iv) food systems stability [See 'Climate Change and Food Security: A Framework' – FAO, 2008]. In other words, climate change influences 'human health, livelihood assets, food production and distribution channels, market flows as well as changing purchasing power.' This article has succeeded to analyse climate change from the yield and area growth perspective, without looking at food affordability, reduced calorie availability, nutrition, market access, et cetera. The detailed definition and proper understanding of these components of food security have dynamic and geopolitical implications across the two major regions in U.S. – West

	need to be well integrated into the national economic development framework.
Introduction:	1. This section is okay.
Literature Review	The authors consulted a number of current and relevant literatures in the process of developing the article.
Methodology:	The methodology adopted by the authors is okay. It forms the basis for the policy recommendations that I struggled to delineate from the article.
Results:	1. The results seem okay.
Discussion: Conclusions and Policy Implications	 The section on policy implication has to be well gleaned out. In other words, the conclusion does not seem to incorporate a set of workable policy recommendations. Lumping policy prescriptions together with the conclusion may not bring out very clearly the policy implications of the issue at hand. Thus, the authors need to expand the policy prescription sub-section of the article. Policy advice should also be target at specific stakeholder groups – government, farmers as lobby groups, non-state actors, etc. Do the outcomes of the study generate any implication for the US National biofuel policy? This should also come out clearly especially when wearing the lens of 'agricultural futures' in the US.

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	Good.
Others:	 There is a need for the authors to include more information on how the United States is responding to global initiatives which relate to food security and climate change. A couple of figures needs to reflect the sources of data.
Decision:	Please see section IV (recommendation) below.

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	3
Contribution To The Field:	3
Technical Quality:	2
Clarity Of Presentation:	3
Depth Of Research:	3

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	X
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	