



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37095
Title of the Manuscript:	BARRIERS TO SUGARCANE PRODUCTION INFORMATION ACCESS VIA ICT: PERCEPTIONS OF EXTENSION OFFICERS AND SMALLHOLDER SUGARCANE GROWERS IN SWAZILAND
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	- The work done is scientifically sound but contradicts the findings (mentioned at the text). Hence, the conclusion lacks sufficient basis. This may be corrected. - There are minor corrections which have been mentioned at appropriate places in the text. This may be taken care of. - Over all, the manuscript is timely for policy makers and may be accepted after the revisions done.	The conclusion on the promotion of women in the sugar industry even though they viewed ICT as a hindrance was mainly based on gender balance. This however has been addressed. Minor corrections have been addressed and are highlighted in the text
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Mentioned on the body of the enclosed text.	These have all been addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The review of literature is quite lengthy and may be shortened without losing the message.	Literature has not been shortened