



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13889
Title of the Manuscript:	BUILDING SUSTAINABLE RURAL LIVELIHOODS: WOMEN AND ADOPTION OF IMPROVED FARMING TECHNOLOGIES IN ZAMBIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. In the abstract, results should be presented in the same order as the objectives. 2. Also in abstract, adoption of fertilizer use should not be in the limelight since it is not one of the technologies the study focused on. 3. In line 48 , the fertilizers or nutrients referred to should be specified (name plus nutrient composition) 3. Need to rationalize info in table 1 and that in the preceding paragraphs. There is repetition of info. (It is better to have description of the variables in the table). 4. In second last paragraph line 324 and 325. there is need to specify how age affects adoption and to state what the cut-off age is. 5. Are the voluntary savings of 85.96% and 84% for non-adopters and adopters in line 214 are statistically different?	➤ Results re-organised as advised ➤ Fertilizer adoption, corrected. ➤ Fertilizers/nutrients referred to specified accordingly. ➤ Table 1 info rationalised with addition of expected signs of coefficients, however, the preceding paragraphs just explain the way variables were measured and their proxies in some cases. ➤ Line 324 and 325 corrected ➤ Voluntary savings not statistically different because the p-value is 0.74 as indicated in table3.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Some statements / sentences are not clear in meaning. Examples are: – Line 61-2 "Studies have.....technology adoption". – Line 56. What does "which includes" refer to, the factors or the technologies.? – Line 324. sentence needs re-phrasing. It is grammatically incorrect. Consider starting with "Adoption of the ox-drawn plough is affected	➤ Line 61-2 corrected ➤ Line 56 corrected ➤ Line 324 sentence rephrased.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	by.....since..... Line 50: In your case s study, are the issues within the farmers' control or not? – Line 23: a mobile phone cannot deliver so remove "and deliver" – Line 32: Change other business" to "non-agricultural activities in generating money" 2. The term "women household head farmers" sounds somehow inappropriate. How about "women headed households" if subject is households or "women household heads" if subject is household heads. 3. There should be consistency in the use of the word agroforestry. It is one word and this should be adopted throughout document. 4. Use non-adopters and not non adopters 4. For all website references, date when articles were accessed should be provided. 5. Reference number 2: name of organization which produced / wrote the article should be provided. 6. Provide citation for statistics on population, in line 18. 6. Need to check spaces between words. There is no consistence as this varies from 1 -3 spaces. 7. Uniform font style and size should be adopted particularly for the abstract. 8. Be consistent with line spacing as there are inconsistencies 8 Numbering of equations needs re-visiting	➤ Line 50 clarified ➤ Line 23 rephrased ➤ Line 32, suggested change effected. ➤ "Women headed households" adopted throughout the text. ➤ Agroforestry as a single word adopted throughout the text. ➤ Non-adopters adopted throughout text. ➤ Dates inserted. ➤ Name of organisation added. ➤ ➤ Citation provided. ➤ Consistency checked and restored. ➤ Font size and style checked and corrected. ➤ Equations re-numbered correctly
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	1. I thought the use of the ox-drawn plough was quite an old technology in southern Africa and that most farmers use the technology. So. I am not sure if it was among the best technologies to consider for this study. 2. Wonder if child headed households were also involved / considered as this would have added an interesting dimension to the study. 3. 4. Live links of the websites would allow easy reference / access to the article , particularly if publication of this article will be on-line 5. Consultation with a colleague who uses econometric models informs that when dealing with binary regression models there is need to interpret the results using the odds ratio or the marginal effects and not the coefficients. - (Authors may need to consult with other users of econometric models) Ethical issues :-Limited. There is need to acknowledge farmers for giving information and devoting their time to the questionnaire / interviews. Not clear when the interviews were done - The best is when the farmers are less busy i.e. off-season.	➤ Actually, ox-drawn ploughs are not commonly used in Zambia. Other technologies like fertilizers and hybrid maize seed are so widely adopted that almost 100% of farmers use them. So the ox-plough was singled out for research because it could help farmers in reducing manual labour which is also insufficient in expanding production. ➤ Child headed households were not considered, this study focused on the women headed households, which in themselves also suffer similar production limitations like child headed households. ➤ Actually odds ratios are included and in some cases have been used to interpret the results. ➤ Farmers acknowledged and time of interviews stated in methodology.