Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_85226**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CONSTRAINTS FACED BY BANANA GROWERS IN ADOPTION OF IPM**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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	**Introduction** The Introduction section should provide recent literature on studies regarding the adoption of IPM. The author (s) should then zoom in on what has not been studied or has received little research attention, such as the constraints you are investigation in this study. The author (s) should finally pose the main research question that is to be answered. **Methodology section** 1. The author (s) should indicate the country in which the study was carried out. 2. The kind of test developed must be mentioned as well as an Indication of how the reliability of the test you developed was established. **3.** There should be a mention of when the data was collected from the growers. 4. Author (s) must indicate whether the questionnaire was written in English or the local language of the farmers and also whether it was self-administered or it was an interview. 5. Results were not discussed which make the paper poor in term of its scientific contribution to knowledge. **Conclusion** What is presented here is not a conclusion but a mere repettion of the study results. The conclusion should indicate: 1. How the ideas in the paper connect to what scholars have written in their treatment of the research topic. 2. What new ideas author (s) have added to the conversation and what ideas in the literature were critiqued. 3. What the author (s) thinks are the limitations of the data used, methods, or results. 4. What author (s) thinks are the consequences or implications of the strongest idea that comes out of the paper for policy or practice. **Reference list** The references do not appear in the paper so one therefore, wonders where they come from.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**D B Afful**
Department, University & Country	**South Africa**