

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_98644
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative study on effectiveness of programmed instruction and lecture method on cognitive domain of extension functionaries
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community as it tries to compare programmed instructions and lecture method which are very useful in the university setting.</p> <p>The title is suitable and trendy. The abstract is comprehensive and captured what it ought to capture from the main manuscript.</p> <p>The subsection and structure are ok for a scientific work of this kind.</p> <p>The study is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not recent which reduces the quality of this work. The literatures are very obsolete. The need to revisit the literatures to make this work trendy is inevitable. Only those literatures that are theories should be left. Old those those literatures below ten years should be removed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable and correct for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The author should revisit all the old literatures and make the work recent.	

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:	Shaibu Leonard
Department, University & Country	Federal University Oye Ekiti, Nigeria