



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	The topic is very relevant. There is a good review of existing literature on the assessment of ICT4D projects. Based on the review, the authors have made an attempt to develop a framework to assess the success of DVPs. The proposed framework is simply a re-arrangement of that of Heeks and Molla in figure 1. So the authors need not claim that they have developed a new framework. The overall objective of the research or paper should be revised. Secondly, the application of the framework in the research does not demonstrate whether the projects have been successful or not. It only raises the general concerns about DVPs. The authors only make comparisons between service providers and clients but not between projects so one cannot tell how the elements in the framework may have influenced the success of projects. There is a good description of the sampling and data management processes but not of the data itself and how the analysis was done. The authors simply state that qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were used! This is inadequate. For example, the results tables suggest the use of Likert Scale to collect the data but this is not mentioned. Data from the application of such a scale is usually analysed by means which fall within the range of the scale and this allows the analyst to interpret the results in the context of the scale.	The reference to 'proposed framework' has been changed to the 'Adapted Heeks and Molla's ICT4D Framework' Overall objectives have been revised The Discussion Section have been revised to address the issue of the success of the projects The Research Design Section has been revised The Data Analysis Section has been revised to explain how qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were used



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There should be a systematic assessment of the elements of the Heeks and Molla framework. That framework is a value chain model therefore assessment of each segment, even if based on stakeholders' perceptions about the extent to which the elements in the components have been satisfactorily achieved, will help to identify the weak links in the chain. The identified weak links then become the basis for recommendations. Editing is required to fill missing words and remove ambiguities.	The Results and Discussion section have been revised to address assessment of the elements of the Heeks and Molla framework The paper has been edited
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		