



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_57079
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving technical support to enhance productivity of rural community in Boloso Sore and Boloso Bombe Woredas
Type of the Article	Full Research Article
Date received	May 2, 2020
Date due	May 12, 2020

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In general, a good and attractive subject</p> <p>The authors were clear in their research plan.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper</p> <p>The Introduction and the literature review are good and streamlined. The content is appropriate backed up by adequate references. However, more references are needed to back up strong statements and statistics. Moreover, some citations are not reported in the references list [see suggested in corrected paper attached]</p> <p>The literature is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions.</p> <p>The methodology is appropriate</p> <p>The results are clear, well presented appropriate to support the discussion about the objectives of the paper.</p> <p>The discussion is adequate and does support the objectives declared through the paper. However, many points need referencing to be validated.</p> <p>Conclusion and recommendations are adequate,</p> <p>Proofreading is needed</p> <p>Major Problem with references</p> <p>1. Referencing needs careful review of write up consistency 2. Add suggested references 3. Add missing citations to the ref list</p>	
Optional/General comments	Copy of corrected paper is attached	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon