



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_54257
Title of the Manuscript:	Attitude of Vegetable Growers towards mitigating the ill-effects of Agricultural Chemicals
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>)

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>Introduction There literature review is incomplete. The introduction has been written without any supporting literature when in fact authors claim a lot of studies have been conducted on the subject. Authenticity of study is secured through providing supporting literature. Also, lack of exposure of the literature gap by highlighting the weakness of previous studies makes the introduction significantly deficient of the major components of an introduction in a scientific paper. Finally authors must add what contribution the study makes.</p> <p>Materials and methods Sample size must also be included in the section and it should be clearly stated how 120 was arrived at. This is a basic requirement in research papers. Since chi-square is the main model in the paper, authors will do well to briefly describe chi-square and what it does.</p> <p>Results and Discussion First, there is need to give summary statistics of the sample. This provides useful hint on the main results. Age, farming experience, frequency of contact with agri extension officers, credit access, frequency of pesticide application, number of training attended or whether trained or not as a dummy plus more. Second, results must be supported by available literature and this satisfactory validates the conclusion</p> <p>Conclusion The current conclusion is not well supported by the results because at no point have the results revealed that there is absence of awareness. It is important to be cautious when making recommendations. What if farmers are only following what sellers of pesticides instruct them. How did authors ensure that farmers do not have any other source of information.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract must be made more concise and clear by reviewing the length of some sentences The application of findings must not be in future tense	
Optional/General comments	Authors must carefully check the typos and review the grammar in the manuscript	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gershom Endelani Mwalupaso</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Copperbelt University, Zambia</i>