

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_117638
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Information and Communication Technology in Enhancing the Effectiveness of Agricultural Extension Programs Worldwide: A Review
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>While the review article carries substantial weight within the scientific community, I have a few comments for the author. The title of the article is suitable, and I have outlined my comments for the author below:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a review article, there are no tables, figures, or graphs included in the study. It would be beneficial for the author to consider incorporating additional relevant tables, figures, and graphs into the manuscript. • The discussions are rather brief, and I would suggest the authors expand on them more thoroughly. • The references provided in the article are insufficient for a review article. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the author includes more recent and relevant literature, and thoroughly discusses the topic under consideration in a comprehensive manner. • Proofreading is required 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But proofreading is required</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Olani Bekele Sakilu
Department, University & Country	Jiangsu University, China