SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJAEES_15178**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Perception of Kenyan Youth towards Agriculture and Necessary Interventions; 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article is categorized as a REVIEW. The Journal's guidelines argues that a review paper "will not have empirical data acquired by the authors but will include discussion of papers published and data acquired in a specific area". In this case, I think that the review of empirical papers on the "Perception of Kenyan Youth towards Agriculture and Necessary Interventions" is not the main issue but the reflection on the situation and the proposals to overcome it. In fact very few cited papers address the perception of Kenyan youth itself. Thus, I strongly recommend to re-categorize the article as a "Commentary / Opinion Article"	
Minor REVISION comments	In the abstract it is argued that: "It is estimated that 64% of unemployed persons in Kenya are youth out of which only 2% have formal education" This seems to be unclear, does it imply that they did have not even a year of formal education? Also in the abstract you talk about "The remaining over 92%". Do you refer to the 92% of the 98% who have not formal education? The 92% of what? It also felt unclear. In the abstract you argue that "The paper seeks to establish the perception of youth towards agriculture and required interventions". Given there is scarce information on this perception in the paper (rather the relating causes and problems are analyzed), I'd recommend say that you Analyze and Discuss the perception... You talk about "ICT". In the text it is not clarified what it stands for.	

	Could you give an equivalent of Kshs 6 billion in any international currency? (perhaps US dollar or Euros?) Finally, if the first recommendation is accepted, the title should be modified avoiding the text 'A review'	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Argentina**