

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118419
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on Scaling Up Successful Agricultural Extension Techniques for Global Benefit
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>1. The manuscript is well written but the objective, the methodology and the finding are not clearly explained. The knowledge that it want to share is not clear. The analysis is not deeply done to demonstrate the link between the scaling up of agricultural extension technique and the global benefit.</p> <p>2. The title is not clear. The manuscript took about extension techniques (FFS, ITC, etc.), their interest and how to implement them on the field to meet a best benefit. It is talking about the qualitative aspects of the technique but nothing about quantitative aspects. It will very difficult to evaluate the benefit of the “scaling up” at global level. It is suitable to use this title “A review on agricultural extension techniques for successfully scaling Up”</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive but it's not reflecting the contents of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Title numeration is not correct (I, II, III, IV, VI, VIII and X). The subsection B in the title I is repeated.</p> <p>5. The scientific manuscript is structured by 5 parts: introduction, methodology, findings, discussion and conclusion. This paper is not well structured in this way.</p> <p>6. The reference are sufficient but half of them are over than 10 years old</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The analysis is narrative. Extension techniques must be analysed with their advantages and disadvantages and, if possible, a comparative analysis between them should be carried out.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adam Mamadou
Department, University & Country	Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique du Niger, Niger