



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This article reflects the current knowledge in sociology. The author frames the central question of this paper as follows: «Which traditional communication ways are still been used in the indigenous communities?»; in answer to the question, the author analyzes the communication ways with the help of the questionnaire of 120 respondents. Results of research are very interesting and to contain scientific novelty. Materials and methods are clearly described and relevant to research tasks. Discussion and conclusion base on actual facts. Author opens prospects for further study of communication ways between people. The article has a variety of virtues; I do however, have certain criticisms. One concerns poor theoretical background for the study of indigenous communication media. Another criticism concerns presentation of the study results. The author fails, in my view, to take a univariate distribution. I think it is more informative to use bivariate distribution and to compare using of indigenous communication media with education level and age.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In article there are punctuation mistakes (for example in lines 35, 40, 49, 60 etc.). I consider that instead of table 1 it is necessary to add representativeness justification in the section "methodology".	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Russia