



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 BJESBS 2629
Title of the Manuscript:	Categorisation Of Agricultural Information Users' Among Young Arable Crop Farmers In Southwest Nigeria.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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 1. The title does not reflect the content. In fact the title has no meaning as presently written. 2. You need to re-write most of the statements or sentences you made in the manuscript as they are wrongly constructed or outrightly meaningless. These meaningless statements made the manuscript very difficult to understand and in fact, uninteresting to read. 3. The introduction section of the manuscript did not show the problem statement that the authors were out to tackle. The introduction is just an agglomeration of	Re-work title, not only to fit content, but to make a meaning to the readers. Some unnecessary words were capitalized in the title. You need to correct these. Re-work abstract to clearly show the problem statement you addressed Examples (not exhaustive, please) (a) The first sentence (Line 27) (b) Statement in Line 29-31 (c) Statement in Line 56-58 (d) Line 63 "forecasted" should read "projected" There is the need to sent the manuscript to a language editor. This is necessary as I do not have the time to point out all the grammatical errors that I have seen in the manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

statements which need to be rearranged to run more logically. 4. In Line 72-74, there is no need to number your research question since you had only one. 5. You said you used multi-stage sampling but you did not provide the justification (s) of your sampling technique at each stage? 6. What do you mean by 15% of the consistent Local Government Area (Line 78)? 7. What do you mean by validated interviewed structured schedule? 8. Your sampling technique is confusing starting from the point when you said you had to construct your own frame You need to		
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

re-write the methodology section to more clearly reveal what was done. 9. What is the formula for your DMRT and under what conditions do you use the DMRT? You are suppose to let us know all of these not just mentioning your main analytical tool in passing. It is not acceptable in research reporting. 10. How did you compute the agricultural information utilization scores? You need to tell your readers all these in the methodology. A lot of values computed and used are not easily understood in this paper 11. How was your agricultural information utilization scores transformed into T-scores? How did you compute your socio-		
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

economic status scores? 12. There are very funny interpretation of results in this study See for example Line 114-123 13. Title of Table 1 is clumsy and does not reveal what is in that table 14. The title of Table 2 does not reveal what is in the table. 15. Statement in Line 169-172 is fallacious as that kind of conclusion can never come from a DMRT result? 16. Rodgers (1995) is missing from the references section. Please, put it in.		
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mafimisebi, Taiwo Ejiola
Department, University & Country	Department of Agricultural Business Management, Mulungushi University, Kabwe, Zambia