



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_15756
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON THE SUSTAINABILITY OF RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN ONDO 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduce FGD in the methodology as it only sprang up in your results. Present tables in the same format all through the document. Some of your tables have vertical and horizontal lines while some have only horizontal.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Effect the editorials as indicated in sticky notes all through the full text.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Could the author (s) find an analytical tool to further buttress their results especially in the areas where they have used agreed, strongly agreed etc. is there a particular tool (chi square, anova, or ppmc) that can be further used to make the results more convincing, scientific, and authoritative?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nigeria