

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_75508
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION CHANNELS FOR TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION AMONG UNDER UTILISED LEGUMES' FARMERS IN OKE OGUN AREA OF OYO STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	<p>Revision of the title is needed.</p> <p>"Assessment of information channels for technology adoption among under utilised legumes' farmers in oke ogun area of oyo state, Nigeria." Does this mean the farmers are underutilise? or just the legumes?</p> <p>It should be farmers who cultivated underutilised legumes. Thus, "Assessment of information channels for technology adoption among farmers who cultivate under utilised legumes in Oke Ogun Area of Oyo State, Nigeria."</p> <p>It was clearly stated in the first paragraph the problem of the study. However, the arguments were not supported by literature or readings. The first four paragraphs are all claims by the researcher.</p> <p>Moreover, the researcher needs to present the gaps about these underutilised legumes. What are the available data about these legumes? How this current study is different from other available studies about these legumes?</p> <p>It was mentioned that the farmers were chosen through snowball sampling. State what are the criteria of selecting these farmers?</p> <p>In the discussion, only tables 1 & 2 were discussed but other table were not.</p> <p>The conclusion should not repeat the findings of the study. The conclusion should answer the question what now? After determining the characteristics of the farmers, what now?</p> <p>Recommendations can only be given if the study had offered "The significance of the Study section" for example</p> <p>Significance of the Study This study is beneficial to the following group of people:</p> <p>Department of Agriculture... Farmers of underutilised legumes... Researchers...</p> <p>In the recommendation, these people will be addressed again.</p> <p>But in this study, no significance of the study was written.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Format the abstract and references according to the journal's format.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> It was not clear in the study the procedures in gathering the information from the farmers. There should be a section on the paper which for <i>Ethical Considerations</i> .	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ariel E. San Jose
Department, University & Country	Southern Phillippines Agribusiness and Marine and Aquatic School of Technology, Phillippines