



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_8548
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRUCTION OF A SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCALE FOR RURAL DWELLERS IN NORTHERN 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	The body of the paper has to be rewritten to make it a reasonable scientific paper. There is no information about the respondents (descriptive analysis). There are many irrelevant tables and calculations included in the results and discussion that should not have been there. If they are important for explanation, they should be moved to appendices and only refer to them in the body. I'm not comfortable with the sampling procedure. It's somehow. That it is called multi-stage sampling does not mean that too many sampling methods should be applied. What is the rationale behind selecting one state out of at least six states in each Geopolitical Zone. The finding is unlikely to reflect the situation in the north (choosing 3 states out of 19states plus federal capital territory). I feel that one state is not a good representative of a GPZ. It is not a must the researcher covers all the three GPZs in the north and come up with unscientific result, rather I advised that he concentrates on a GPZ and choose randomly at least 3states. The methodological section of the paper was not clearly spelt out. There are many irrelevances under the section. The discrimination index table should not have been included since it is well recognized procedure. He should have stated.....following Ebel (1972)	All the tables are relevant since they show the procedure of the scale construction. This is already conducted research. It is not possible to increase the sample. Treated



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The researcher should recheck the correlation coefficient results presented. How come all the values are positive and the same significant level ($p=0.00$) The knowledge gap that the paper is trying to bridge is not clearly spelt out. Bearing in mind that we are in dynamic world and that socioeconomic status of individuals' changes, there is the need to update the literature on socioeconomic status to reflect current situation in the study area.	Checked Treated under section 1.2
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It's like the abstract was dedicated to sampling procedure. Even the sampling procedure is confusing and not scientific. Using purposive sampling to select the final respondents is an indication that the researcher is not less concerned with precision. The abstract should be rewritten to contain only the: 1. The objective of the study 2. The type of data, sampling technique (brief) and method(s) of analysis utilised. 3. Major findings 4. Recommendation.	All the stated parts are included
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The researcher should address the issues raised to enhance the content of the paper. Also the format of the journal should be followed by the writer.	Treated