

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_102535
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF EXTENSION ADVISORY SERVICES IN CONTRACT AND NON-CONTRACT BROILER FARMING
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it is important as it seeks to assess a farming service provider. It is import to assess how the service provider is going to help farmers boost production</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>Yes it is</p> <p>Yes they are appropriate subsections</p> <p>No , it lacks acknowledgement of statistics and information on the background</p> <p>References are not are not used anywhere in the document ie there are no citations within the document</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes though there is repetition of points in some cases</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The background should be supported by literature -clarify on the applicability of advisory services - Tables should be inside the document and not after reference -Explanations of the Table should be close to the table for easy reference -if a writer say that 45% of the respondents strongly agreed and 55% did not agree, then there is no need to talk about the other options as 45 +55 =100% -indicate who is the integrator -write in full eg CBF if you are using it for the first time in your document then abbreviate eg Central Bank for Farmers (CBF)</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Faith Kurete
Department, University & Country	Women's University in Africa, Zimbabwe