

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_122938
Title of the Manuscript:	Mobile Technology for Farmers: An Overview of Agricultural Apps
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the growing significance of mobile apps in agriculture, offering practical insights into how these tools can enhance productivity for small-scale farmers. I appreciate its focus on a relevant and timely issue, though a more detailed analysis of the challenges could further strengthen the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract should clearly state the key findings, such as which mobile apps were found most effective and the main challenges identified. This would make the conclusion more specific and provide readers with a clear takeaway.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure need better logical flow. The introduction should clearly outline the research problem and objectives, followed by a distinct literature review. In the methodology, clearly explain each step, and ensure the results and discussion sections either stand alone or are well-subdivided.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript employs a clear and systematic methodology to evaluate agricultural mobile apps, using objective criteria such as user ratings and download counts. The study's approach to quantifying app effectiveness is appropriate and provides a reliable basis for the conclusions drawn. Additionally, the analysis of farmer feedback on app usability adds depth to the research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I recommend adding recent references that focus on the latest developments in mobile technology in agriculture, as well as studies that explore the impact of mobile apps on small-scale farming productivity and sustainability. These could provide a more current perspective and enhance the overall scholarly contribution of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xinli Shen
Department, University & Country	China

Review Form 3