



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_44240
Title of the Manuscript:	Identified Problems and Effectiveness of Growth Enhancement Support Scheme (GESS) in Inputs Delivery in Southwestern Nigeria
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Small scale must be changed to small-scale among all the manuscript. Per cent must be changed to percent among all the manuscript. Line 20: the majority... a high level Chi square must be changed to Chi-square among all the manuscript. Line 25 + Line 27: the effectiveness Small holders must be changed to smallholders among all the manuscript. Line 41: the world's Line 44: a low Line 61: another input sector or other input sectors Line 68: an-agro input Line 70: e-wallets and attend training (no comma) Line 71 + Line 296 + Line 299: agro-dealers Line 76: staff and about (no comma) Line 79: by the farmer and then (no comma) Line 82: the direct Line 112: a schedule was Line 141: a secondary Lines 153 + 154: a functional Line 160 + Line 169 + Line 185: the majority Line 164: the radio and (no comma) Line 173 + Line 563: certificates and (no comma) Line 175: education and (no comma) Line 178: had a positive Line 246 + Line 267 + Line 270 + Line 505 + Line 507 + Line 673: middlemen Line 250: the poor Line 255: a high cost Line 257: the use Line 259: an insufficient Line 262: a benchmark Line 269: a poor Line 272: a high Line 273: production and (no comma) Line 280: maybe Line 283: a waste Line 284 + Line 363 + Line 513: helpline Table 2 + Table 4: middlemen Table 4: helpline Line 457: me, ... (put comma) Line 463: the open Line 470 + Line 472 + Line 474: got Line 500: a positive Line 505: remove <u>to</u> Line 508: through Line 516: effectiveness and (remove comma) Line 525: the arrival Lines 540+ 542 + 545 + 560 + 573: the effectiveness Line 542 + Line 567 + Line 572 + Line 625 + Line 634 + Line 642: a significant Line 546: varies Line 550: owning Line 551: the majority</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 580: an effectiveness Lines 581 + 590 + Table 7 + Line 667: the effectiveness Line 585: favor not favour Line 589: farming and (no comma) Line 613: the relationship Line 615: shows Line 616: the majority Line 630: an increase in the frequency... to an increase Line 631: in favor of the effectiveness because of the Line 635: most of Line 638: an attitude Line 641: an increase Line 643: the increase Line 644: an increase Line 65: the majority Line 648: an alert Line 670: ,of course, Line 671: because of Line 673: the required Line 676: the attempts Look to those and correct: 677: Insufficient 679 + 681: Increase + Favour 680: Use 683: Probability 684 + 689: ??? 710: Identified 719: comparison 724: non-existence 726: poor 728 ? 735 ? 737 ? 738 ? 742 ? 745 ? 749 ? 751 ? 752 ? 755 ? 756 ? 762 ? 764 ? 766 ? 773 ? 774 ? 777 ? 778 ?</p> <p>The authors must review science domain author guidelines which were documented here (http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/25/authors-instruction) for original research papers:</p> <p>"Papers that include original empirical data that have not been published anywhere earlier (except as an abstract). Null/negative findings and replication/refutation</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>findings are also welcome. This type of paper normally should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages of text (including references) and should not contain more than 15 figures/tables. We advise a length of 3000-6000 words (including everything)".</p> <p>It must be re-written and re-submitted for the secondary evaluation. Or, it could be split into several articles and re-submit again.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohunnad Massimi
Department, University & Country	Jordan