

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_102439
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON IMPACT OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY ON FARMERS KNOWLEDGE AND ADOPTION ON POTATO PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES IN JAUNPUR DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH
Type of the Article	Survey

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is good for the scientific community because it has pointed out relevant issue that affect Jaunpur district on how ICT could be integrated into their food production on the field.</p> <p>2. I propose this title for the paper "IMPACT OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES ADOPTION FOR POTATO PRODUCTION IN JAUNPUR DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH" since the original title is too lengthen (number of words) and not clear enough.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive. However, it must be summarized to avoid repetition of the study result to make it catchy.</p> <p>4. The sub-sections and structure in the manuscript were appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not enough for this paper. A lot of categorical statements were made at the introduction section without source to back such claims. Eg. 'On productivity front, although India has grown significantly, yet the growth rate is much lower than that of the area during this period of time'; 'Agriculture plays a vital role in the society and the economy of the country', etc The references were not recent since they dated 7years or more (Example Kampschulte and Karsten Eilert et al., 2016) while current sources abound.</p> <p>7. REFERENCING STYLE: The author is mixing two different referencing styles (APA and Harvard) for in-text citation and referencing. It must be corrected and choose one style for consistency throughout the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. However, there were future tenses at the MATERIALS AND METHODS section which must be changed to past tense. Eg. <i>Out of this Jalalpur block will be selected.....</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The entire paper needs proof reading to address grammar and punctuation issues to make the paper stands out.</p> <p>The title for paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 were just too long and must be revised to reduce the 'two line' sentence to captions.</p> <p>The findings were not discussed and supported with literature to confirm or otherwise. Rather, the results were only presented, without drawing conclusion and discussion of the results.</p> <p>The above issues must be attended to.</p>	

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:	Cosmos Kwaku Nutakor
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana