# 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!***

| Date Manuscript Received: July 6, 2017 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted:July 19, 2017 |
|---|---|
| ***Manuscript Title:*** ***RISK AND SOCIAL INTERACTIONS IN THE ADOPTION OF IMPROVED DAIRY BREEDS IN SMALLHOLDER AGRICULTURE*** | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 91.07.2017 | |

## 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** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>Needs to specify the study is in reference to Kenya | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **3** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>**Abstract should provide highlights of more results. Results coverage to be enriched in abstract.** | |
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | **2** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>**The document requires significant editing throughout to improve grammar, formatting and structuring.** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | **4** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>**Adequate and well detailed methodology anchored in well reviewed literature** | |
| **5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.** | **3** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>**The discussion section has some issues to be addressed in revision.**<br><br>See below comments to authors | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | **3** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>**Generally the conclusions are valid and derive from the findings** | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | **4** |
| *(a brief explanation is recommendable)*<br>A large body of relevant and current literature has been reviewed and referenced. | |

## 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):

i. The effect of age though cited as indeterminate is also noted to vary with technology. E.g. technologies that require mental agility maybe more easily adopted by youth compared to older people, technologies that require physical effort can also deter adoption by older persons, etc.

ii. The assumption that educated people seek out-of-farm employment does not necessary explain low adoption. In fact in the high potential dairy areas in Kenya well educated people are among the largest investors in the sector, and they usually will want to put in place the best available technology and breeds in their investment, etc. This should be better discussed.

iii. It is not clear why land size has negative effect. Are these regions practicing zero grazing or free ranging? In the Rift Valley free range is typical and one expects land size to have a positive effect, the bigger the better. Not so?

iv. Is it milk yield variability that presents greatest risk or variability in market conditions? A greater reality is the unpredictability of markets and prices, especially for fresh milk vendors. At least the understanding by farmers is that yield is a controllable parameter, to an extent, depending on enterprise management, resource input etc.

v.

vi. Need to explain the observed relationship between price of dairy breed and positive effect on adoption. Cost of animal is higher for superior breeds and often can discourage

adoption. Explain.

vii. What is the cause and what is the effect: that increased farm visits increase adoption? Possible if farm visits are for providing information, but it can also be that increased farmers who have adopted superior breeds tend to attract more visits from extension personnel etc.

viii. Also separate cause and effect: that farmers conserving fodder are also likely to adopt superior breeds. It is more often that farmers first adopt superior breeds and then address the feeding needs by also adopting fodder conservation technologies. Not vice versa. Explain.

ix. Observation that fodder shortage is negative but not significant. This deviates strongly from expectation, Fodder shortage is currently a major consideration in deciding whether to adopt or not especially in high potential areas for dairy. Why the unexpected observation?

x. Reference to cattle traders. Are these typical cattle traders or should they not be called breeders (the more professional term)? These are farmers who keep high yielding dairy breeds but not necessarily for milk production, rather to sell heifers and high yielding milkers. The market for this is well developed and lucrative in Kenya.

xi. One can not quite say the extension system is not effectively functional in Kenya. I think the point to make is that social interactions are an important complement to the existing extension service system. With the movement to devolved government system, the agriculture functions are receiving significant attention and budget from county governments, so extension is likely to be generally improving.

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper is derived from a chapter in a dissertation, and the conclusion section indicates clearly so. The author should have taken time to re-model the material to the expected format for a journal publication. It needs revision to align to paper format.

The issues raised warrant clarification above minor revision but does not necessarily warrant major revision.