



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_7661
Title of the Manuscript:	ICTs as Enabler to the dissemination of agricultural technologies in Ghana: A case study in the East Akim District of the Eastern Region of Ghana
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(i) Table 1: age distribution should be re-addressed. The class interval should be reduced to a maximum of 10 instead of 20, i.e. 20-29, 30-39, ..., 60-69. This would give a clearer details. Also, ensure that the intervals are regular (ii) Table 2: do not approximate the percentages in the table. Male is 69.5%; female is 40.5% (iii) Table 3: Your calculations of percentages in Table 3 are incorrect (iv) Table 4: do not approximate. (v) Table 4: what of the farmers that use combinations of any of the "information seeking channels"? or do you want to say/prove that there can't be farmers who would use combinations of such "information seeking channels"? (vi) Lines 160-190, 203-207 and 220-226 would have better been in Literature Review, and not under Results and Discussion (vii) Line 196-197: this assertion has no basis from your paper presentation so far! (viii) Line 208-209: this should be shown from your study presentation (ix) Line 219-220: NO! This study has not shown anything	The necessary corrections had been done and highlighted in text The necessary corrections had been done and highlighted in text Farmers were asked to indicate one response so there would be no room for combination of responses. Part of the statement had been moved to the introduction and had been highlighted accordingly. Has been shown accordingly
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(i) State the source of information on line 21 (ii) Line 45: Muriithii (2009) is not listed in your references	The source had been stated Murithii had been listed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(iii) In line 47-48, there is a clash in date. The activity in question was captured in 2005, but you quoted WSIS in your reference for the same issue as 2003. How come? How could an incident that occurred in 2005 be reported in 2003? (iv) What do you mean by “semi educated”? (v) Table 3: use “no formal education” instead of “no education”. No one could be said to have absolutely no education (vi) Line 120: i want to believe you are referring to Table 4, and not Table 2 (vii) Line 140-141: how can radio and television be referred to as “the preferred channels” when it is actually ranked 3rd behind friends and relatives and mobile phones? (viii) Line 166: what do you mean by “podcasting”? (ix) Line 167: explain what you mean by “podcasts”? (x) Line 195: you are not expected to dwell on the assessment of extension officers. What is your own assessment? That is what your study is supposed to show!	The correction had been made it was 2005 not 2003 The semi educated had been removed and replaced by levels of education. No education has been replaced by no formal education The error had been corrected The error had been rectified That aspect had been deleted The assessment of the authors had been provided and highlighted in the text.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(i) The paper is more of a “report” than a “research article” (ii) The objectives could not be said to have been realized. Objective 1 is only presenting the “agricultural information seeking avenues” in the study area. It is not determining anything (iii) Objective 2: By the virtue of its statement, it is a cause-and-effect form of objective. The “reasons” could be said to be the “factors” (the cause) that determine the usage of a particular “information source/media” (the effect). Hence, it is expected that the author employs a form of regression analysis such as Tobit, Probit, etc. as the case may be. The independent variables (i.e. the factors) may be the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, the environmental factors, and other variables applicable to the study (iv) Refer to the body of the article for some additions and removals. RED is addition. BLUE is what you need to delete	The paper is preliminary research one to identify the problems, that is why the authors chose short research article The objective had been modified. The operative word should be identify not determine, the correction had been made and highlighted accordingly. This was a preliminary study further studies would require regression analysis as suggested by the reviewer. Those had been taken care of.
--	---	---