

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127937
Title of the Manuscript:	Integration of ICT in Agricultural Extension Services- A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of how ICT integration is transforming agricultural extension services. By synthesizing evidence and case studies, it highlights the potential of digital tools to address critical challenges in agricultural knowledge dissemination, including accessibility, efficiency, and inclusivity. The manuscript contributes to ongoing discussions on sustainable agricultural development, offering insights into overcoming barriers such as the digital divide and promoting gender-inclusive approaches. Additionally, it identifies emerging trends and actionable strategies that researchers, policymakers, and practitioners can leverage to enhance the scalability and impact of ICT in agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Integration of ICT in Agricultural Extension Services - A Review," is clear and accurately reflects the article's content. However, it could be made more engaging and specific to highlight the transformative role of ICT in modernizing agricultural extension. Consider some alternative suggestions below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Transforming Agricultural Extension: The Role of ICT in Bridging Knowledge Gaps" 2. "ICT Revolution in Agriculture: A Review of Extension Services and Digital Innovations" 3. "Empowering Farmers Through ICT: A Comprehensive Review of Agricultural Extension Services" 	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key aspects of the manuscript. It highlights the transformative role of ICT in agricultural extension, provides examples of successful initiatives, identifies challenges like the digital divide, and outlines potential solutions and future trends. However, there are areas where minor additions or refinements could enhance its clarity and impact:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include specific outcomes or metrics: Adding quantified impacts, such as the percentage increase in productivity or the number of farmers reached, would strengthen the abstract's effectiveness. For example, metrics from case studies like mKisan or Digital Green could be briefly mentioned. 2. Clarify future trends: While emerging technologies such as AI, blockchain, AR, and VR are mentioned, briefly stating their practical implications or expected future impact would make this section more concrete. 3. Balance between challenges and opportunities: The challenges (digital divide, gender disparity) are well-covered, but emphasizing how current interventions are addressing these issues would provide a more balanced narrative. 4. Streamline language for readability: Some sentences could be more concise to enhance flow and readability. For instance, the sentence about emerging technologies could be broken down for better clarity. 5. Highlight global relevance: Briefly emphasize that these findings are globally significant and applicable across various socio-economic and agro-climatic contexts. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate, as it presents a well-rounded discussion on the integration of ICT in agricultural extension. It references established ICT tools, successful case studies, and relevant challenges in the sector. The concepts, such as the digital divide, gender disparity, and emerging technologies like AI and blockchain, align with current research and practical applications in the field. However, some areas might benefit from additional scientific rigor or clarification:</p> <p>Suggestions for Enhancing Scientific Accuracy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Citations for Key Claims: Ensure that all claims, particularly those about the success of initiatives like mKisan and Digital Green, are backed by recent and reliable data. Include statistics or references that validate their impact. 2. Discussion on Emerging Technologies: Emerging technologies such as AI, blockchain, and AR/VR are mentioned, but more detail on their proven applications in agriculture could strengthen the scientific grounding. For example, referencing studies that quantify the effects of these technologies on crop yields or supply chain efficiency would be helpful. 3. Digital Divide and Gender Disparity: The discussion on challenges is compelling, but it could be improved by including data illustrating the extent of the digital divide or gender disparities in specific regions or populations. 4. Scalability and Long-term Impacts: While short-term benefits of ICT are highlighted, a discussion of long-term implications, such as environmental sustainability or resilience to climate change, could enhance the manuscript's scientific depth. 5. Global vs. Regional Contexts: The manuscript should ensure a balance between global trends and region-specific issues. For instance, the adoption of ICT in low-income versus high-income countries might involve different challenges and solutions. 6. Limitations of ICT Tools: Include a brief acknowledgment of potential risks or limitations associated with ICT tools, such as data privacy concerns, reliance on internet connectivity, or maintenance costs as potential impediments. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript's references appear comprehensive, with a mix of recent and older sources that provide a solid foundation for the topic. However, a few issues and suggestions for improvement are noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Repetition of References: References 6 and 13 are identical. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>References 17 and 33 are also identical. This repetition should be addressed to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>2. Balance of Recent and Foundational Works: While there are recent publications (2023–2024), the manuscript relies heavily on older works (e.g., Qamar, 2003; Hanna, 2003). While these may be foundational, more recent literature that builds on these concepts might be beneficial.</p> <p>3. Coverage of Emerging Technologies: Given the manuscript's focus, additional references on AI, IoT, and precision agriculture beyond those cited would strengthen its depth. Consider adding studies like: More recent systematic reviews on the impact of digital tools in agriculture. Field studies or meta-analyses discussing the adoption and challenges of ICT in agricultural extension programs globally.</p> <p>4. Diversity of Sources: While journals and dissertations are included, more sources from leading agricultural technology conferences (e.g., IEEE conferences on IoT in agriculture) could be insightful. Reports from organizations like FAO, World Bank, or IFPRI, especially regarding the intersection of agriculture and ICT, would enhance credibility.</p> <p>5. Specific Suggestions: Review work on digital platforms for agricultural markets, especially in developing economies, to add more applied insights. Include case studies or project reviews (e.g., Digital Green, Precision Agriculture trials) to demonstrate practical applications.</p> <p>6. Formatting and Citation Style: Ensure all citations are formatted uniformly per the target journal's guidelines. For any online resources or reports, ensure DOIs or URLs are included.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is commendable and aligns well with scholarly communication standards. The text employs clear, formal, and professional language, with precise terminology relevant to the subject matter. Strengths:</p> <p>1. Clarity and Structure: The abstract and introduction are concise yet comprehensive, providing an overview of the key issues, objectives, and scope. Subsections are well-organized, making the content easy to navigate.</p> <p>2. Technical Precision: The article uses appropriate technical terms such as "precision farming," "digital divide," and "blockchain," demonstrating subject matter expertise.</p> <p>3. Citations and Examples: The inclusion of real-world examples (e.g., mKisan, Esoko, and Digital Green) and references to studies enhances credibility and scholarly relevance.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Sentence Length and Readability: Some sentences, especially in the abstract and introduction, are long and densely packed with information. Breaking them into shorter sentences could improve readability. The article is well-suited for academic audiences and can serve as a robust scholarly piece with minor refinements.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Darlington Arnold Mangaba
Department, University & Country	Rusangu University, Zambia