



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6663
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Digital Village Projects in Developing Countries - Case of Kenya
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Inadequate. It does not capture what it supposed to capture and it fail to give trend of the topic. This means that the introduction is not adequate to explain the topic under review. The introduction suppose to capture the concept of Digital Village Project. No in-text citation. The work needed to be restructured and re-submit.	The Introduction has been revised accordingly
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The work need to be restructured to follow Author's Guideline.	The structure has been reviewed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is interesting and it is related to the study. The subject of the paper is of significant value but it does not add literature to the existing knowledge on the area. The work did not show academics review and it lack focus. It was not well arranged.	We believe the work has academic value and is the revisions done it is now focused