



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_27094
Title of the Manuscript:	AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION IN THE FACILITATION OF IMPROVED SUGARCANE PRODUCTIVITY AMONG SMALL SCALE GROWERS IN SWAZILAND
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	Major adjustments are needed from title all the way to summary. Some empirical evidence would have made the paper strong It should be taken as a discussion paper to open research gaps around that theme. SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON PAPER ARE BELOW: 1. Based on content of paper, the best title should have been close to: SWOT analysis of extension services among smallholder sugarcane producers in Swaziland : A Review of Literature 2. What is new given the traditional role of extension services. 3. Lines 10-25 in introduction do not have a single citation yet must communicate the state of art knowledge and debate in the subject matter. 4. Line 65: How about annual employment by government? 5. Line 84: Try and compare Swaziland to the devolved extension service in Kenya 6. Lines 93-156 would add more value had the author articulated how the various stakeholders could partner through synergy and maximise extension benefits to farmers. 7. Citation [2] on the same page is over-quoted. 8. Table 1 lines 186+ Replicating Abdu-Raheem and Worth (2011) work is not necessary. Either you critic the work or leave it out 9. Lines 205-267: A critic on how ICT has been used in extension and how it could work in Swaziland would add much value on this literature review. 10. Lines 271-275 not necessary. 11. Lines 336-356: Check out how farmer organisations have worked	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and failed in Kenya 12. Lines 374-387. Specifying the sugarcane stakeholders and how they could link up would be very beneficial. 13. Line 407 purports that the paper has discussed different means by which agric extension can assist farmers. Not quite. It's more of a literature review. A survey to yield some data on how ext can best work among small scale farmers would have added much value. 14. Lines 412-423: content not based on research, which makes the usefulness of this work wanting. NB: The Author should consider re-working this paper based on a SWOT analysis. Both primary and secondary data would be needed. Conclusions and recommendations would then be made so paper could be of use in policy formulation and practice.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Fuchaka Waswa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Agricultural Resources Management, Kenyatta University, Kenya</i>