



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_15904
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Rural Farmers about Family Planning in Ondo State
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. I think the title of this paper should read 'Awareness, Perception and Utilization of Family Planning among Rural Farmers in Ondo State'. 2. Please include the statement of the problem and justification for conducting this study among farmers in your introduction. 3. Talk about the utilization of FP in Ondo State and especially among farmers and if they are not utilizing it then state the factors responsible for this 4. Please use updated references of at least 2010 and above because so much has been recently done on FP 5. Objectives, Hypotheses and justification for the study should be merged together under the introduction except if that is that journal style. Also write in pros and avoid using bulleting in your writing. 6. There are serious flaws in this study methodology which is the backbone of every research. The research should talk about the scope of the study, target population including inclusion and exclusion criteria, sampling techniques and sample size determination, methods of data collection and contents of instrument(s) used, data management and analysis and ethical principles followed. 7. The investigator should explain the meaning of 'accidental sampling' used for this study.	All the corrections have been effected in the manuscript where necessary.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. Fig. 1 was not adequately presented. It does not look professional. Please separate all the socio-demographic and do not merge everything into just a chat. Different chat should be used in presenting each socio demographic 9. In your abstract, it was stated that descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used for data analysis whereas I can see results for qualitative data which you cannot use this statistics to analyse. 10. The author should let us know if this study is qualitative or quantitative. It was started under the awareness section that 'focus group interview were conducted'. Do you mean focus group discussion (FGD) or in-depth interview? If qualitative method of data collection was used then I expect to see quotations from respondents' responses. 11. Likert scale was used in measuring respondents perception of FP and this is not appropriate for perception but attitude and even if you must use this scale then you needed to score and make it categorical and present result for number of respondents who had negative and positive perceptions based on your scoring. No ethical issues were addressed in this paper. The author failed to follow ethical principles. No ethical clearance was obtained and informed consent of the respondents was not taken.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. There should be heading title 'results/findinds' before socio economic of the respondents 2. All the word percent should be changed to '%' 3. You don't use percentages when presenting qualitative results. For instance, this presentation the reads ... 'All (100 percent) of the respondents attested during the focus group interview conducted' is not correct. This presentation looks like a quantitative findings. 4. Almost all the chats in this paper were not professionally presented. Please re-draw all the chat. You may need to consult expert in doing this 5. Please get an editor to do grammatical justice to this paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodological flaws surrounding this paper are just too many and many readers would not be able to understand this paper. The author should please elaborate more on several issues stated above. The justification stated in this paper is not scientifically appropriate.	