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)

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	. **Introduction** - note that the objective of this work is to highlight/report the opinion of DVPs stakeholders on the implementation of such DVP projects and to seek alternatives that will ensure the full harnessing of the many benefits and potentials void of project failure. To this effect, the study should adopt a Quasi-Experimental design as in the research methodology and structure of the	

	roject. . The study is thus missing the following: (i) Statement of problem which must be clear and concise and (ii) Purpose of the study (optional). . **Methodology** - the use of SPSS is not necessary as the sample size is quite small and has nothing to do with regression, correlation and bivariate or multivariate dataset. The use of simple percentage as indicative in the work will suffice. . Results and Discussion - note the following that i. Result in the work does not portray any fact about analysed data. The result is should be tabulated and then explained. The explanation (will) suffice only if the table and groupings as indicated in the work, was there. To this effect, I do strongly recommend that the author reposition the tables in the appendix in the body of the work where appropriate as well as those that indicate the groupings as suggested by the author as well as it should be properly referenced in the work. The tables in the Appendix should also be properly named as Table 1, Table 2 and so on. ii. Table 1 and II should be part of the research design. iii. Table 3 should be the analysed result. iv. Table titled Constraints should be brought back to Discussion 4.2.1 section under constraints and explained v. Other tables titled Benefits of DVPs should be appendix . Thus, sections 4.1 and 4.2 needs major rework to reflect the tabulated values - so that the discussions that follows can be well-understood by the intended author from the author's perspective of the stakeholders.	

	Conclusion - what and which strategy/strategies does the author(s) feel should be put in place to avoid the project being a failure. These should be named as recommendation(s). . Reference - ok.	
Minor REVISION comments	Related Work - has some grammatical errors such as: a. Line 6 - unlock the potentials... b. Line 6 - of the life of the poor, especially in the rural areas... c. Line 9 - services provided by such projects... d. After figure 1...use bullet styles a, b, c respectively etc	
Optional/General comments	Check for grammatical errors	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**OJUGO, Arnold Adimabua**
Department, University & Country	**Federal University of Mathematics and Computer Science, Federal University of Petroleum Resources Effurun, Delta State, Nigeria.**