



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9557
Title of the Manuscript:	INFORMATION NEEDS OF KENAF FARMERS IN OGBOMOSO ZONE OF OYO 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 <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	Very few statistics, making it more to a narrative/description than a scientific paper No clear conclusions Introduction is too long	An agricultural extension paper is richer when narrative and that does not make it less scientific Conclusions were restricted to the findings of the study as recommended The long introduction is intentional because many Nigerian readers would not be familiar with kenaf and the authors would like to answer their questions rather than raise more
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should avoid abbreviations without indicating the meaning, like line 12: PPMC?	PPMC is more like 'e.g.' or 'etc' in the academic community (anyways, it is done)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The whole manuscript text and its structure should be prepared according to AJEA rules.	Done