



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>)



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	Title: Title should be changed to "An assessment of availability and benefits of information and communication technologies (ICTS) in agricultural development in Enugu state, Nigeria" Abstract" • Good, however needs improvement • Add objective of the study • Make it short, complete and should contain the summary of the whole research work. Keywords • Keep them in Alphabetical order Introduction • It is too short for this research work • Add more recent references • Support your introduction with recent references • Check grammatical mistakes Material And Methods 1. Discuss why these universities selected 2. Discuss with agricultural point of view, 3. Explain Why 30 lecturers and sixty students were selected for the study? 4. Discuss criteria for selection of respondents Results And Discussion 1. Well explained, but needs little modification as the findings should be more discussed with the available data, 2. Support with relevant and recent data 3. There are some misconceptions, make them clear- for example: It means that 9.4% of lecturers and 25% of students had not readily available, means 90.6% (lecturers and 75% students had readily available, While radio and leaflets (37.5% each not available) discuss properly? 4. When only 30 lecturers were selected, as mentioned in the materials and methods, Then why 32 in results and discussions? FACSIMILE: only 9.4% (10%) indicated non availability, means 90.6% (90%) are of opinion that they are available, then why to put those who said they are non-available 5. Make entries in tables relevant, short, meaningful, to the point 6. Need grammatical corrections Conclusion. • Good, but needs modification. References 1. Not as per journal standards. • Akpan, 2014, Not mentioned in the references, if same as Akpan, 2008, then mention them as Akpan, 2008a and Akpan 2014b. 2. There are missing references-for example • Lemke and Coughlin, 1998; • Davis and Tearle, 1999; • Bashorun, Isah and Adisa, 2011. • Check all the references in the main body of reseatch work and put them in reference section.	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical corrections	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zahoor Ahmad Shah
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences & Technology of Kashmir, India