SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_47938**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of Selected Factors on the Choice of Agriculture Subject among Secondary School Students in Kisii and Nyamira Counties**
Type of the 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	**1. Follow the journal's citation and referencing style. Ensure that all and only those references that were actually cited in the text are included in the list of references at the end of the paper. As such there is a need to double check all the citations and references. There are 22 references cited in the text but were not included in the reference list and only 13 out 77 listed in the reference list were actually cited in-text, which are just too many to mention here one by one.** **2. There is something wrong in lines 15-16 of the Abstract. In line 15, it was reported that there are 352 respondents but in line 16, the sample is said to consist of 330 students and 18 teachers, which when summed is only 348. There is also a need to mention the population, that is, from what population did the 352 respondents came from, as well as the 22 sample schools.** **3. The Likert scale used and the scoring (scores with corresponding interpretation) should be clearly presented in the Methodology so that readers can understand the meaning of means and standard deviations presented in Table 5. It seems that Strongly Agree was coded by 1, Agree by 2, Neutral by 3, Disagree by 4, and Strongly Disagree by 5 (which is uncommon, since the common coding was 5 for Strongly Agree down to 1 for Strongly Disagree so that the higher mean implies greater agreement). Anyway, there is just a need to explain the scoring clearly.** **4. There is a need to correct the values presented in lines 266-267. For example, the Pearson chi-square value is 2.567 and not .109 (this is the p-value).**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The word "relay" in line 86 should be "rely". 2. Do not begin a sentence with a numeral. For example, in line 304, instead of "32.4%", begin the sentence with "Sixty-six out of 204 or 32.4% of the students said …" Revise also the sentence in line 367 that begins with "6.5%". 3. Since there was no recommendation given, the section title in line 403 should be "CONCLUSIONS" and not "CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS".	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Romer C. Castillo*
Department, University & Country	*Batangas State University, Philippines*