



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9743
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Use of Indigenous Communication Media among Rural Dwellers of Osun State, 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	<u>(2014-AJEA-9743)</u> I have review the manuscript and convinced that the manuscript has a value for publication in AJJAEES Journal, however, the author/s should make a serious major refinement of certain sections including the abstract, materials and methods and the discussion before it can be accepted for publication. Below are my overall comments about the manuscript. The corrections and suggestions have been indicated (highlighted) on the paper (E-mail attachment). <u>Title</u> The title is short and straightforward. <u>Abstract</u> The objectives and motivation of the study are not clearly defined in the abstract. Put some figures to verify your findings. Complete the abstract with the practical implications of your findings. <u>Introduction</u> Professionally approached but the author must provide a clear definition of indigenous communication media (ICM), different types of ICM, merits of ICM and its disadvantages. There is some inconsistencies in the manner in which the author organizes the manuscript. For example, the format style, size and spacing is not the same. <u>Materials and Methods</u>	We agreed with comments on abstract and we have included the practical implications of the findings. Most of the comments mentioned in introduction have been addressed. We have included the advantages and disadvantages of ICM. On materials and methods: Most of what the reviewer's observed were in the materials and material e.g interview schedule was used Results and discussion We combined the results and discussion together. We have included hypotheses in the body of the work. We do not agreed with the ideal of not reporting key informant reports. It usually indicated that the researcher actually reported what the respondents said.



SDI Review Form 1.6

This section was approached very cautiously; however there were some few discrepancies. For example, the symbols used to designate latitudes and longitude is not correct. Some of the statements were made without supporting references. The author did not clearly indicate on how did he/she record and manage the data before subjecting it to the statistical analysis. Was the interview conducted orally or it was in a written questionnaire form? How was the respondents selected? These questions need to be addresses especially for a social study like this.

Statistical analysis

Here I expected the author to analyze the influence of socio-economic (demographic) characteristics of the respondents on the different types of indigenous communication media which were unearthed within the studied communities. **The descriptive statistics is not good enough to tell the whole story.**

Results and Discussion

Results: The results were presented in an understandable manner. Some of the figures that were mentioned can be rounded off e.g. number of years of the respondents. Some of the table titles (Table 2, 3 and 4) are not clear or are not properly done. There are some few occasions where the results have been repeated. Is it necessary to quote what the respondents have said? Those quotes could have been used to beef-up the discussion section. The most pressing issue is that the results were not discussed at all.

Discussion: To start with, there is no discussion at all. The results were not discussed. Discussion is the most important



SDI Review Form 1.6

	section of the study whereby the author explains all the mechanisms that might have influenced the results of the study and supporting his/her findings with relevant literatures. By doing this, he/she allows the reader to better understand the argument and be able to see if the objectives of the study have been met or not. Without a robust discussion no concrete conclusions can be made out of the study. This section need to be attended to on a very serious note. <u>References</u> There are no consistencies in the citation of references. In many cases different font style and size were used. Some title of the books and journals were written in italics while others were written in bold. The last reference (Line 317) was indented while the rest of references were not. <u>Recommendation</u> My suggestion/recommendation is that the paper be returned to the author for serious major revision. Thanks and good luck to the author. Kind regards Dr. Nndamuleleni Romeo Murovhi	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		