

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103746
Title of the Manuscript:	Problems faced by farmers using digital tools in Agriculture in Central zone of India
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 relevant for scientific community now that the world is digital and everything around the world is turning digital including agri-entrepreneurship</p> <p>2-The term "Problems" as used in the title doesn't reflect the true meaning of what is contained in the document..Maybe "challenges" would suffice</p> <p>3-Theoretical foundation should have been added even if brief.</p> <p>4-The subsections are ok though inconclusive.Abstract should be a clear reflection and a representation of what is contained in the entire manuscript.There should be "take homes" observations in the conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>5-The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6-References are sufficient..However, the author should avoid ghost referencing and also avoid presenting complete paragraphs without relevant citations especially in the background of the study. References should be in APA an be within the prescribed age limits.</p> <p>7-The author should beef up the following sections: Background, theoretical review.,and the findings too..</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1-The language is of quality</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1-More materials can be added to beef up the quality of the published paper</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:	Allan Kihara
Department, University & Country	USIU-Africa, Kenya