

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_101204
Title of the Manuscript:	A Standardized scale to measure attitude of Agricultural scientists towards ICT
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 manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable for the purpose and content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract is sufficiently comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The sections and subsections are generally appropriate. However, I suggest that the subsection titled "Item Collection" under the section of Results and Discussion should be moved to the methodology section because it describes how data were collected rather than what was collected.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. It is backed by literature.</p> <p>6. Some of the references do not have dates of publication. Here is an example: Seel NM. Attitude formation and change. Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning. Available:https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_359</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use of language is generally good. However, the manuscript should be subjected to further proofreading by an English language expert. There are some instances of errors.</p>	
<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)
<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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Mukuni
Department, University & Country	School of Education, Virginia Tech, USA