

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_82772
Title of the Manuscript:	Information Communication Technologies as Potential System of Knowledge Dissemination in Rural Agricultural Development
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments Topic lacks scope (dependent and independent variables) No Objective (General/specific to guide the study – lacks direction) No Methodology (not scientific – lacks steps which the results were achieved) Too many repetitions as indicated in the review Paper is neither a review article nor an empirical study Lacks substance as a journal material Confusing Referencing does not match Needs total overhaul	Topic should have the dependent and the independent variables and scope Objectives (Main and specific) should be provided to guide the study How to achieve the goal of the study has to be defined. The methodology. This is the main ingredient of a scientific research. Repetitions should be limited, instead, the literature should be made in line with the research questions and objectives The paper should concentrate on a particular of reporting, either as a review of technologies or the impact or effect of technologies on extension and farmers response to the technological innovations. If a journal paper, it should present the methodology and results appropriately, with novelty There is no logical reasoning and harmony in the report. It supposes to be a systematic flow, which should follow the sequence of objective 1, 2,3,4.... The references are clumsy. They should be consistent with the subject matter Except on the satisfaction of the Journal editors and publishers, the paper need total overhaul to make a global scientific readership and application because for a scientific report to be accepted, it must be replicable.	
Minor REVISION comments Ideation Number of Pages	The idea is a good one, but the reporting is awkward The literature should be modifies to capture relevance and contemporary backups from other climes. The experiences and knowledge can be replicated in India.	
Optional/General comments Re-arrangement and major modification required	If the author follows similar research reporting and really go to field, the paper will have relevance	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Udeme James Usanga
Department, University & Country	National Root Crops Research Institute, Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria