



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_10046
Title of the Manuscript:	Preferred Sources of Information Used by Cassava Farmers in Delta State, 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>)



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	• Contribution to knowledge: Article updates knowledge base. • Audience: Of broad interest to international agricultural and extension educators. • Usefulness: The article helps extension educators improve effectiveness. • Rigor: content is empirically, logically, and theoretically sound. • Focus: central ideas, findings and conclusion generally adequate • Understandable: author(s) uses appropriate language and the writing flows smoothly. • Overall readability: • Line 36 – Hahn et al. 1979 - stale reference • Line 52 – “group method of communication such on” to be changed to group method of communication such as... • Line 75 & 76 (Nat. Population Commission, 2006) should read (National Population Commission, 2006). • Line 77 – the economy; should read The economy • Line 78 – Local Government Areas (LGS,) should read Local Government Areas (LGAs)	Although Hahn et al (1979) is stale, the issues they raised are still very relevant and true today in cassava production. I agree with the Reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Line 83 – Five (5) Local Government Areas; should read five (5) LGAs • Line 88 – is Ughelli and Ethiop East LGAs; should read are Ughelli North and Ethiop East LGAs. • Line 113- eigen values; should be written eigenvalues. • Line 129 – provide advisory service; should read advisory services • Line 131 – should read Table 1: Distribution of cassava farmers according to socioeconomic characteristics. • Table 2: cross-check likert-type score for column 2, row 9 and 10, i.e 4(12) and 3(9). They are actually 4(0) and 3(0) respectively. • Lines 165 to 167. Source the definition of homophily. • Line 186: neighbours (0.830). the zero before the point is a letter word. Replace with Arabic zero- numeral(0.830) • Line 195 vol.1982 should read Voh.1982. • Lines 201 to 203. Table 3: A third column variables communality values should be inserted into Table 3. The inclusion of variable communality value not only enhances the interpretability of the factors (Homophily; heterophily) but reveals the proportion of variables variability that is explained by the factors. For example, communality value for neighbours can be obtained as follows: $(0.286)^2 + (0.830)^2 = 0.770$	I agree with the Reviewer in everything here, and I am very grateful.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor revision is to be done	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		