



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_40102
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Agricultural and Fishery Extension Service Delivery Field Agents' Mass Media Dependency Status on Climate Change Information Sourcing in Akwa Ibom State
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Summary: This paper examines the climate information seeking behavior among agricultural and fishery extension agents in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Overall, I like the direction that the paper is going, and I think it may provide another case study of the agricultural and aquaculture advisors' knowledge and access to climate information. However, the paper has a variety of problems in the execution of these ideas. First of all, the authors claimed that it is a review paper, but I think the authors are missing some great literature on similar topics. Furthermore, the manuscript is far from ready for submission to a journal. The manuscript is poorly written. There are errors in every sentence and many of the phrases don't make sense. The tables are also poorly made. This manuscript is poorly referenced and is very poorly structured. I suggest to the authors to fix all the issues, rewrite the paper and find a professional to proofread before submit to this journal or any other journals. Main Comments 1. What is the motivation to write the paper? The manuscript needs an introduction section.	Please, the paper is research article and NOT REVIEW PAPER. I am sorry for the mixed up if I had clicked review article while submitted the article instead of research article. May I beg to disagree with your perceived understanding of the intension of the article. The article was particularly interested in Mass Media dependency for Climate Change Information Sourcing among the field agents. So it was expedient to investigate their information sourcing aptitude and then their inclination to mass media resources available to them. Not the "climate information seeking behavior among agricultural and fishery extension agents in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria." The reviewer have coined to work with. However I have done grammatical review. That had been done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There is a great literature on farmers' access to knowledge or information. Why is climate information an important in famers and fishermen's decision making? Who are the extension agents? Are they funded by government? Do private sectors and NGO involve? Is it the No. 1 information source for the farmers and fishermen? What role does the extension agent play in Nigeria in terms? Do they give any suggestions on fertilizer, timing, management practices as well as fishing? The manuscript lacks the motivation to do the research. Why is mass media important in the extension agents? Do farmers and fishermen have access to mass or social media? 2. Index analytic procedure First of all, many of the acronyms are not defined in the manuscript, such as OND, HND, and CCISB. In Table 3 and 5 and Sections C and E, I didn't see the definition of CCISB and CCISU indices. For example, I don't know what is composite index derivation in line 173. Was it based on the questionnaire and what was the original questions? Is it based the amount, or the accuracy, or the timeliness of climate information? If there are no information on CCF, CCISB and CCISU indices, the conclusions or the claims that the authors made will not be supported. 3. Previous literature (Literature Review) As stressed in my other comments, past literature is not referenced enough throughout the paper despite the fact that it is called a	These concerns had been addressed
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	review paper. The literature review section is missing in the manuscript and the authors didn't cite many published peer-reviewed papers. They have 18 references in total and only a couple of them are related to agents' information seeking behavior. I strongly recommend the authors to read peer-reviewed papers in other countries on the similar topic before they revise the manuscript, such as Haigh et al. (2015) and Liu et al. (2018). Haigh, T., Morton, L. W., Lemos, M. C., Knutson, C., Prokopy, L. S., Lo, Y. J., & Angel, J. (2015). Agricultural advisors as climate information intermediaries: Exploring differences in capacity to communicate climate. <i>Weather, Climate, and Society</i>, 7(1), 83-93. Liu, T., Bruins, R. J., & Heberling, M. T. (2018). Factors Influencing Farmers' Adoption of Best Management Practices: A Review and Synthesis. <i>Sustainability</i>, 10(2), 432. 4. The manuscript is far from ready for submission First of all, there are multiple grammatical errors in almost every single sentence, which seriously impeded the readability of the paper. At times, these errors interfered with the content, causing uncertainty about what was being said. The paper needs serious proofreading. Second, the tables are poorly made. Professional tables don't have the vertical lines!!!	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		