



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_31598
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption level of Masumbi (Citrus sinensis) grower's and its relationship with their personality traits in Haryana state
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The abstract should bring out the key findings and conclusions stemming from the study. [see comments tracked in the manuscript]. In addition, the introduction should be sufficiently motivated to bring the research objectives, questions and justification for the study. These are lacking in the manuscript and should seriously address. 2. Literature review: Insufficient literature has been reviewed on the concept adoption despite the fact the literature is replete with empirical adoption studies. The authors are advised to build a story line by discussion the gaps and conceptual framework for adoption 3. Methodology: the methodology should be revisited. Choice of adoption levels: low, medium and high is arbitrary without justification. The methods of analysis are not appropriate. Multiple regression analysis is not clear what was regressed against what and why?? A study like this should have conceptual framework and an empirical model to be estimated. What variable are included and why they are included? 4. Results should be presented after the above 1 & 2 are cleared and then the discussion of results should follow. After thorough discussion of results, then the author can draw logical conclusions. 5. The manuscript should be subjected to a professional language editors.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Basil Mugonola
Department, University & Country	Agribusiness and Rural development, Gulu University, Uganda