



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The analytical section is Ok but can be improved by: - Including an explanation on the choice of the model used. For example, some previous studies have used the Double-Hurdle (D-H) model – which is really a parametric generalization of the Tobit model, whereby 2 separate stochastic processes determine the decision to adopt and the intensity of use of the technology. You need to motivate the choice of the model you settled on. - Ensure you identify the variables soon after stating the equations, not later as done in say, equation No. 5. - Before presenting the output tables 3 – 5, it would have been better to state the expected signs of the coefficients, based on theory and logic – how they are expected to influence adoption. The output tables would then have been discussed based on how they conform to, or contradict the apriori expectations. - In both equations it's not clear whether you checked for autocorrelation among the diagnostic tests. - The effect of education on adoption of new/improved technologies has been found to be +ve by many previous studies. Yours seems to yield a -ve influence, perhaps due to the type of technologies studied – the ox plough and agroforestry?????	• Justification for choice of model made. See Line 110-114 • Expected signs of variables indicated in Table1 based on hypotheses. • Diagnostic tests done are indicated in line 170-175 • Education is clarified in line 325-332.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The conclusion is not well written, it is merely an extension of the discussion section of the paper. One would expect to see how these findings are supportive of 'building sustainable rural livelihoods....' This section needs to be more 'punchy'.	Conclusion was re-written with addition of recommendations that derive from the results.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please note the following; - Ensure references are arranged alphabetically - Include only those references that are referred to in the text, delete all else. - Edit the work to remove typos and add those words that are missing, e.g. line 29, 61, 192, (the paper was in PDF so I couldn't track changes)	- References were re-arranged in alphabetical order - Editing of the entire paper was done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Paper employs necessary scientific rigour.	