

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology      |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJAEES_98915   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFECTIVENESS OF WHATSAPP IN DELIVERING LIVESTOCK ADVISORY SERVICES |
| 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript) The topic is important but the writing is very poor not convenient to a reputable journal.</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br/>Not comprehensive since it doesn't include figures.</p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br/>No</p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br/>No</p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>The topic is very interesting. However, several issues might hinder the quality of the manuscript as mentioned in the reviewed version. This include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number of words are fewer than recommended.</li> <li>2. Many typing error.</li> <li>3. The introduction and methodology are too short. Only one paragraph can not guide the reader.</li> <li>4. The methodology is very poor. Many items are missing including the types of data and how the data were analysed</li> <li>5. Harmonization in typing is missing.</li> <li>6. The presentation of results and discussion are very poor.</li> <li>7. The tables titles are not self explanatory</li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? No</b></p>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | Celestin Munyaneza                                    |
| Department, University & Country | Rwanda Institute for Conservation Agriculture, Rwanda |