

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_105151
Title of the Manuscript:	Information Communication Technology Tools for Animal Husbandry Technology Dissemination
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It informs the scientific community on the importance of using ICT technologies for crop, livestock and fish production and marketing, and problems constraining the same. Other scientists can use that information to research on the constraints and hence generate empirical information to solve the problems permanently. Also, the manuscript has potential to inform strategies to implement the main recommendation of the article, which is "To cultivate a positive attitude among farmers towards the integration and utilisation of information and communication technology (ICT) tools". On p. 19, the article says that KVK Mobile App provides guidance on agricultural practises for crops, animals, and fisheries. Based on this information, the title could have been on agriculture instead of animal husbandry. Then, agriculture would have been defined operationally as encompassing crops, animals, and fisheries. The abstract should be improved to include the problem statement in one sentence, the general and specific objectives, the methodology (how the review was done), succinct findings, the two conclusions written on p. 23, and the recommendation written on p. 23-24. To a large extent, the subsections are appropriate, but they would be more appropriate if there were objectives to which they would be tied up. Scientifically, the manuscript is not bad, albeit it has the faults specified, which are actually minor. The references are sufficient and reasonably recent; they include ones of 2022 and 2023. I have no suggestion of an additional reference. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The English language is a little problematic, with some simple present mistakes, mistakes with articles, and inadequate punctuation of appositive clauses whose items are separated by commas. I have pointed out most of the mistakes in track changes. The author(s) should hire a competent linguist to remove those mistakes and probably others. The author(s) regarded the following dependent clause on p. 20 as a sentence: "The identification of superior bulls and elite females." 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is worth publishing after minor corrections.</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:	Kim Abel Kayunze
Department, University & Country	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania