



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_48337
Title of the Manuscript:	ADOPTION OF INTEGRATED HOMESTEAD FARMING TECHNOLOGIES BY THE RURAL WOMEN
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This research is presenting very interesting information about how rural women may incorporate technology into small-scale farming. This is actually a very important issue, especially in those areas where women are excluded from the decision-making processes, and yet are the main agricultural force.</p> <p>The manuscript (MS) needs to be revised and reorganized in order to fully understand the variables that were measured and the extent of the results obtained. Here I present some comments in order to improve the MS and help to bring the important message this research should give.</p> <p>Some parts may be summarized. For example, the first paragraph of the Introduction should be summarized into a single sentence, and the second paragraph has the four first sentences starting with "homestead", so authors should shorten this section. Introduction should be no more than two pages, and there is no need to include so many subtitles.</p> <p>The Material and Methods section has many unnecessary subsections (population of the study and design of the study are not giving relevant information; sampling procedure, instrument for collection of data, pre-testing and collection of data may be all together in a single section, called "data sampling", for example), and important information is missing. A location map or the coordinates of the study sites should be given, as well as some information that help the reader to understand the social and economic context of the study area. You say that 100 women were interviewed: have they been equally taken from the four study sites? You also keep mentioning the "integrated homestead farming technologies" but you did not explain what is this about, what are those farming technologies. And information about how you measured all the variables should be more clear and organized.</p> <p>But the main concern about the MS is that there is no discussion at all! Some results are briefly commented in the conclusion section (which is not the right place to do that), but there are no references, so the reader can not understand the extent of the results obtained or their implications. This section needs to be substantially improved.</p> <p>All tables need a self-explanatory legend, and have to be mentioned in the text.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>At the end of the second paragraph you mention the Census of Agricultural and Livestock 1983-84. It lacks a reference. And there is not a more recent census to refer to? Please give the meaning of the acronyms the first time you mention them (e.g., RDRS, page 2, which is actually a main issue along the MS).</p> <p>Page 4: "It is said that women perform most of the household activities". Please provide a reference to support that.</p> <p>The table in objective no. 1 should be in Materials and Methods section, as well as the scope and limitations of the study</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <p>This is how you should name this section, instead of "Methodology".</p> <p>Please define "upazilas".</p> <p>In the "selection of variables of the study", the text is unnecessary. Instead of it, you should explain a little more how some of these variables were measured (e.g., cosmopolitanism or innovativeness). You explain some of them latter in the section, but all this information is disorganized, and it is difficult to follow and understand.</p> <p>In Data analyses, you should state clearly between which variables you tested for correlation.</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> All the first paragraph of this section is not needed. You do not need subtitles if you are going to start every section with the subtitle itself. For example, "Age of rural women" section starts with "Age of rural women ranged from...". It is no needed. And, since you have a table summarizing the means and SD, you do not need to repeat all of the again in the text. Page 13: You do not need to explain again how you calculated the TAI, you already did in Material and Methods section. Page 14: Please, do not repeat all the information that is in the table, only mention (and discuss) the most relevant. And the English needs to be revised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marina Mazón</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional de Loja, Ecuador</b>