

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJAEES_104155
Title of the Manuscript:	Constraints Faced by Maize Farmers of Tamil Nadu in Use of Smartphone for Accessing Agricultural Information
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>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic of the paper is certainly very modern and current as it relates to smart devices and their usefulness for specific activities. Therefore, the topic of the paper is the Internet of Thing in one hand and the reviewer believes that the authors should refer to this type of device in their paper in order to write a section about smart devices.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The reviewer suggests improving the structure of the paper in terms of writing one or more sections in the paper that would include a more detailed explanation of the use of smart devices in households and human activities. Just as agriculture is a part of a country's economy, so too is the cultivation of maize varieties a part of agricultural activities. The paper is too short and should be expanded.</p> <p>5. The methodology in the work is too simple because it is reduced only to percentage analysis, that is, simple sums of respondents' answers and their presentation in tables. The reviewer suggests a stronger methodology, that is, crossing the data obtained from the survey in the sense of applying a statistical method, which would lead to deeper knowledge about the use of smartphones in areas in India that deal with the cultivation of maize. This paper looks like a simple term paper and is not very suitable for publication in a serious scientific journal.</p> <p>6. Unfortunately, the references used in the paper are minimal, only 5, and the reviewer's suggestion for authors is to add at least 10 to 15 references and more different author's research related to the topic of using smartphones in agriculture</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The reviewer's general comments refer to the suggestions to the authors to take a more serious look at the issue of using smart phones in agriculture and to insert a stronger methodology, statistical data processing, so that the work could be published in one of the serious scientific journals. All comments have already been made by reviewers in the previous review section. The paper requires major revision.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Biljana Stojan Ilic
Department, University & Country	Serbia