



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_47120
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' improved Breadfruit awareness and adoption status in Southeast Nigeria.
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>)

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>Reframe/replace the first two sentences on the abstract. Also summarize the conclusion of the work to convince your readers.</p> <p>Grammatical errors should be corrected before the final acceptance. Some of which have been highlighted on the manuscript. Where Tables were mentioned in the text should be well stated. I noticed that, though, Tables were numbered, reference to Table 1 on page 7 is missing. Also, I think it's not scientifically sound to start results presentation with Table so, so and so. Rather, it will be better to say, The data in Table 1/Table 2 shows the reason.....</p> <p>The authors are advised to support the information on the study areas with a clear map depicting the sampled areas/study areas. This will give easy access/understanding to the study areas.</p>	<p>The first two sentences on were reframed. The conclusion has been summarized in consideration of other reviewer's comments. Seen grammatical errors were corrected and highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Table 1 mentioned in the text is now well stated and referenced accordingly. I agree. Corrections were made in this regard.</p> <p>The information has been supported with a map currently named Figure 1. Information on initial qualitative enquiries added.</p>
Optional/General comments	Relevant and adequate literature were reviewed. Methodologies are adequate and up-to-date.	I agree.

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)	The reviewer's comments added value to the manuscript.