



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	A very good attempt by the author/s, however there are some serious shortfalls that need to be addressed before the paper is accepted for publication. As a review paper, one would have expected the author to be very much detailed and specific to the topic. In other words, the author must have broken down this review into categories that will allow the readers to follow and understand the whole concepts. The author identified a problem facing the small scale cane producers and presented different models that were used in Swaziland to try to solve the problems. But, what the author did not indicate was how do other cane producing countries are performing and how can Swaziland cane farmers and extension can extrapolate that information and use it to improve the production in Swaziland. There are lots of information on how small scale farmers can use to improve their production. SASRI for example, it works with small scale farmers and they are doing just fine. TSB in Mpumalanga Province is another living example on how extension workers, cane farmers and the industry can work together for the benefit of the country. The literature review provided is very weak with full of references that are not closely related to the topic. The pillar of a review paper lies on the literature review. I therefore suggest that the author must extend its literature review	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	even to the outside borders of Swaziland in order to make this review more robust.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My final suggestion is that the paper must be sent back to the author in order to address all the queries and suggestions that were presented above.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	<i>Agricultural Research Council, South Africa</i>