



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_28196
Title of the Manuscript:	'Contextualizing Information Communication Technologies: Sociological study of e-Choupal'
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<i>This paper is well-written centered on the interplay between ICTs innovations and extension services in rural areas of India. I think author(s) bring up some important issues that will spark considerable debate, both in terms of what have actually found and in terms of the ICTs policy implications and ICTs applications in rural settings. My comments as indicated below are mainly aimed at tightening up the logic and clarity of what author(s) has communicated. I summarize my comments based on the order I found them in the paper because these seem to be the points where the issue comes up.</i> <i>i) 117 = Title case for Figure 1 is incomplete please check and revise accordingly.</i> <i>ii) Mixing of ITC and ICT, please use one type of abbreviation.</i> <i>iii) 3 citations are missing in your reference lists (Rao, 1992; ITC, 2010 & Paul 2003).</i> <i>To be precisely the paper adheres to ethical issues.</i> <i>This paper does make an original contribution and expansion to existing knowledge and application of the knowledge itself especially with regard to ICTs policy implications and its application in rural settings.</i>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<i>It has been covered under i), ii) & iii) above. The methodology part of the research paper should be briefly and logically detailed enough that readers can replicate</i>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>the research, and assess whether the methods justify the conclusions. This does not come clear in the methodology section.</i>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<i>To be precisely the paper is an extension of existing knowledge and application of the knowledge itself to a wider audience. As such, some minor revision should be done for clarity purposes as illustrated above. Once these comments are addressed and journal guidelines adhered, I propose for the paper to be acceptable with some revisions.</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edwin Estomii Ngowi
Department, University & Country	Department of Development Studies, The University of Dodoma (UDOM), Tanzania