

Review Form1.7

JournalName:	AsianJournalofAgriculturalExtension,Economics&Sociology
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJAEES_114518
TitleoftheManuscript:	AdoptionofmanagementtoolsbyfarmersinthecontextofagriculturalextensionandadvisoryservicesinMenouaDivision, WestCameroon
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearch Article

## Review Form1.7

### PART1: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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community engaged in development of farmers. Contributes valuable insights into adoption, motivational factors, difficulties and strategies about management tools.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the title is suitable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</b></p> <p><b>Manuscript is well structured and properly organized into subsections. Absolutely, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>The concepts cited to introduce the topic and its importance, mentioned references are OK but still author has scope to add few recent references.</b></p>	<p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>As far as possible, we have reviewed the references and added a few more recent ones.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The quality of English used to interpret the manuscript is SUITABLE for scholarly communication.</p>	<p>Ok</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Introduction part is appropriate and justifying to the title and objective of the study. There is scope to elaborate problem statement.</p> <p>Sampling procedure used appropriately. Author can define and explain dependent variable and its measurement process in the methodology section.</p> <p>Author should use abbreviation for better understanding of the short forms.</p> <p><b>revision in introduction and methodology part as mentioned above will improve the concreteness to the manuscript.</b></p>	<p>Dependent and independent variables have been specified. abbreviations are explained.</p>

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	