



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_7010
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Extension Methods in Disease Prevention: A Case of Smallholder Poultry Production Systems in Egypt
Type of the Article	Research 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	I must commend the author(s) on trying to contribute to the issue on mapping effective strategies to reach farmers. While the paper is generally well written, I have the following points which I feel would enrich the paper: 1. The author(s) propose four methods of extension, including one that combines all "the all three methods". However, there is no consistency with regards to the combined approach where the authors interchangeable use "the all three methods" group and "all methods" group, causing confusion to the reader. This needs to be addressed throughout the manuscript. 2. Methods of data analysis should be moved towards the end of the Methods section e.g. lines 215-220 3. The author(s) tried to combine the Results and Discussion section, but the results are hardly discussed, save for two refs in one sentence (page 10, line 382). Discussion of results with relevant refs is required here to	I agreed with the reviewer in the mentioned comments. Points 1,2,3,5,6,8 and 9 were were put into consideration in the revised manuscript. Regarding point 4 adding (N) for more clarification for distribution of the respondents. Regarding point 7 adding Mean because it is necessary for reader to know the score for respondents in the pre-test and post-test .Also, the effectiveness measurement was depend mainly on the means.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	enrich the paper. 4. It is not clear why the author(s) chose to duplicate results in tables e.g. Tables 1-3, was it really necessary to give results of 'N' along side percentages? 5. There is need to separate methods from results. This is repeated in the "results and discussion" section. e.g. lines 322-323, 368-370, etc. This needs to be addressed. 6. Try to lead the reader to your results, e.g. "<i>At least 30% of the respondents had a high knowledge level of managing poultry diseases (Table 3).</i>" Instead of writing "<i>the distribution of... are presented in Table 3</i>". The authors should pay attention to this for all the data presented. 7. Table 5. It is not really clear what the mean and SD values there represent. 8. The "conclusions" section is unnecessarily long, it should just answer the study objectives and give recommendations. I notice some of the statements here were what was expected in the "discussion" e.g. line 441-444. The section need re-visiting. 9. Also we normally do not expect to see references in the "conclusions". This sections should have your assertions, not what other found/ or did.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: - Line 10. Do not start a sentence with a figure or abbreviation. Change “120” to One hundred and twenty Introduction - Lines 28-30. Insert a reference for the statement. Again for lines 38-40. - Line 43. Insert the phrase “which has been a problem” between “avian flu” and “ since 2009” - Line 44 – replace the word “problematic” with “challenging” - Lines 46-49 need rewording to reflect exactly what the major source of income is. - Line 49, replace the word “So” at sentence start. - Line 136: End sentence at “...globally”. Delete the phrase “which lead at the end to achieve” and start a new sentence “The approach is often associated with high levels of rural...” - Line 139: replace “assistance” with “interventions” - Objective 3: Is it “skills acquire” or “skills acquisition”? If the later, correct throughout the manuscript. Methods	All minor revision comments were put into consideration in the revised manuscript.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Line 178. Check earlier comment on use of numerals at sentence start Results and Discussion - Line 266: Replace “Personal and socio-economic” with “General” - Line 268, Delete first sentence and appropriately describe the results, referring the reader to the appropriate table. Also check other similar sentences. - Line 332. Replace word “section” with “proportion” - Table 6. Insert zeros (0) on all those SD values, instead of omitting the zero and starting the number with a point (.) Conclusion Re-do the whole section clearly separating discussion points from conclusive statements. References Check whether the yare in alphabetical order, ref lines 504-506 seem out of place	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		