



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12323
Title of the Manuscript:	Agricultural Water Technologies' Adopted by Smallholder Farmers in Lare Division, Nakuru County Kenya
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) It is necessary to use more authors to support affirmatives and results found in the paper. Example: lines 47-49: ... <i>adoptions depends on socio-economics</i> ... Which studies have shown this? Lines 211-212; 218-219, have results that can be better discussed comparing with other authors. 2) It is necessary better explain the sampling technique. Which confidence interval was used? 3) Abstract (line 15): remove words "frequencies" and "standard deviation" that were not used in the text.	1) Reference is now indicated, thus 47-49: ... adoptions depends on socio-economics ...[5] Reference [16] and a new reference [18] have been incorporated in lines 213 and 216 respectively in additional to a quotation. 2) The phrase "at 95% confidence interval" has been included and highlighted in line 106 as instructed. 3) Words "frequencies" and "standard deviation" have been removed as instructed and replaced with the word 'percentages' and highlighted in line 15
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table 2 is unnecessary. The information is repeated in the text.	I agree.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the results, sections 3.1 through 3.8 are too short. Maybe some of them can be grouped for the text does not get so divided.	I agree with this suggestion and have grouped Lare Division farmers' demographic information together.