



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	-Streamline the abstract into just one paragraph with about 350-400 but containing the purpose of the research, objectives, hypothesis, methodology, results and conclusion plus recommendations. -line 18-22, include principal and concluding statements. There is need to rework this paragraph to make it more captivating. -line 24, need for reference at the end of statement. Does it follow that with land sizes below 2ha, then automatically there is low yield leading to food insecurity? I actually think that with intensification, farmers can still be food secure. -line 33-36, what is the impact of the seed pack? Has it improved food security? If no why? This would show the need for adoption or promotion of agroforestry technology. -line 43, this sentence is too long, break it so that it can maintain its rhythm. -line 43-50, this section is not concluded, it is hanging. Line52-54, is this common knowledge? What is the source of such information -61-64 and 65-71, join these two paragraphs. Authors need to show principal and concluding statements. Their paragraphs are hanging. - line 81-96, there is need for cohesion to show how	➤ Abstract streamlined, but according to the guidelines, it cannot be in one paragraph because it has sub-sections where objectives, methodology and results are indicated. ➤ Line 18-22 was revised, but these were statistics and facts that did not need conclusions from the author. ➤ Line 24 reference added. ➤ Line 33-36 The seed pack has improved food security, but the use of inadequate amounts of fertilizer and low adoption of technologies have led to lower yields. This is highlighted in Line 40-44. ➤ Line 43-sentence broken into two. ➤ Line 43-50 conclusion inserted. ➤ Line 52-54, reference added. ➤ Paragraphs joined.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sampling was done from the district level down to the household level. See Zamasiya et al., 2014. What is the scientific basis for selecting a total sample of 164? Was this part of an existing project or it was specially a targeted research? See Franzel et al, 2007 cited in Zamasiya et al., 2014. -what guided the selection and use of the multistage logistic model? What are its strengths and weaknesses? -what is the theoretical basis for selecting the model variables? What is their probable effect on the outcomes (knowledge and adoption). -line 187, include t-statistics and p values. -line 267, Include Pseudo R2 -Line 283-285, no link between the two statements. -323-334, this is not a conclusion, rewrite the conclusion and include recommendations.	➤ Sampling, origin of study, sample selection, the reasons for selecting the model used is highlighted in revised paper. ➤ T-statistics and P-values inserted. ➤ Pseudo R2 ,added ➤ Conclusion re-written and recommendations added.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-I find the topic to be too crowded, I suggest that the authors rework their title and streamline to mean exactly what they want.	➤ Title changed as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-Generally, the authors need to improve the way they construct their paragraphs by including principal and concluding statements. Their paragraphs are dry and not captivating. They could do well by referring to notes on academic writing.	➤ Paragraphs streamlined, concluding statements where they were lacking added and references made.