

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript describes the results of a survey on access to agricultural information using smartphones. While there are many papers on developing software, this manuscript is a novel paper that investigates the usability of software from the end-user's perspective. This manuscript was a paper that raised several points that software developers should consider during software development.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes, but it's better if authors can refine the abstract. It is preferable to outline the paper by focusing on only a few key findings and stating their importance in broad strokes, rather than stating the details of the findings for each item in numerical form in a straightforward manner. The abstract should be written in such a way that after reading the abstract, the reader will want to know more details.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. No. There are only 5 citations in this manuscript, I think this is not sufficient. Please find out if such a study has ever been done on India or any other country in the world. If there is such a survey report, please cite it and discuss how it differs from your survey report. Perhaps different countries have different survey items and would make for an interesting discussion. Conversely, if there is no such survey, please discuss why there wasn't one.</p> <p>7. Please use bar charts to represents the investigation results rather than Table 1 and Table 2. (here is an example, https://www.anychart.com/ja/chartopedia/chart-type/percent-stacked-column-chart/)</p> <p>8. Please spell out FAO, GOI, ICT, ...</p> <p>9. Please unify the expression of percentage. E.g., most percentage are written as 85.00% in the manuscript, but few is written as "42.50 per cent".</p> <p>10. In the conclusion, authors state "To overcome these constraints State Department of Agriculture may consider providing assistance to farmers to purchase high end smartphones." However, due to the fast development of communication technology and frequent software updates, even a high-spec smartphone will be out of model after a couple of years. Does the government really need to provide financial assistance to purchase these high-spec smartphones? Are there other ways to overcome these problems? The authors should discuss more different perspectives and conclude carefully.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jianqiang Sun
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Agricultural Information Technology, Japan