



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_39067
Title of the Manuscript:	BENEFITS AND AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (ICTs) IN AGRICULTURAL TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The topic did not reflect the contents. The contents deal with only major universities in Enugu State, not all the universities in the State,, talk less of the entire Enugu State. Therefore, it should be recasted. 2. Akpan (2014), Oshinaie and Adekunmisi (2012), Higgings (2003), Wheeler (2000), Okiki and Asiru (2011), Sharma (2009), Salaam and Adegboro (2010), Ansari and Zuberi (2010) and Bashorun, Isah and Adisa (2011) were cited but not listed. Thus, should be listed. 3. Wheeler (2001) was listed but not cited. 4. One UNESCO (2002) was cited but two were listed. The one not applicable should be deleted. 3. Lines 22 - 24, reference needed.	Thanks for your comment. The correction has been effected in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Lines 108 – 118, 135 – 144 and 159 – 171 repeated the results already presented in their respective tables instead of picking the few most important ones and discuss the results. Thus, should be recasted. 2. Table 1 shows that in most cases, higher proportion of students than that of lecturers in the institutions stated that there is availability of ICT facilities in the institutions. What are the reasons and implications of this? 3. Tables 2b-d indicated that on the average, students in the institutions are more competent in using ICT facilities than their lecturers. What are the implications of this to the process of teaching and learning?. What should be done by the institutions to deal with the nuance?	Thanks for the observation. The corrections has been effected.
Optional/General comments		