

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision. ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Email:

Date Manuscript Received: 14-7-2017 Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 14-7-2017

Manuscript Title:

RISK AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN THE ADOPTION OF IMPROVED DAIRY BREEDS IN SMALLHOLDER AGRICULTURE

ESJ Manuscript Number: 0791/17

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions Rating Result

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. 4
Although the work has been done in Kenya (which could be included in the title) it has applications to general smallholders.

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. 5
This addresses an informed audience, I do not know about 2nd and 3rd movements of milk output.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. 5
Splendid command of the English.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.
(Indeed the procedures are well described.)

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
(The statistics I cannot judge.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.
For a non-zoologist the outcome seems appropriate.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.
Quite an admirable list of appropriate references.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed

Accepted, minor revisions needed x

Return for major revision and resubmission

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

None

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I presume you have an animal scientist and a statistician among the reviewers - remarkable that you find an agronomist-botanist like me to review this paper.