



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_30078
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of the Determinants of Mass Media Usage by Urban and Rural Farmers in Kogi 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 <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	The title should be rephrased. When one read the article, there is no impression or indication that the author investigated the determinants of Mass Media Usage by urban and rural farmers. The article is more about differences in age, education, income, household size and other listed factors, and how these influence farmer's usage of mass media. These do not in any way serve as determinants for a farmer to use mass media. [This is the impression I got] The abstract should be rewritten in a way that it gives a snap overview of the findings. The findings listed say little about the findings as discussed in the article. For instance: it is stated that the study showed that 82.50% and 68.13% of the urban and rural farmers were males while 17.5% of urban and 31.88% of rural farmers were males. This could surely be due to sample bias. It should be stated as such. The author must rather give an overview of how levels of education, age etc were found to influence the use of mass media by the farmers and how these differed between urban and rural areas. Introduction a) Paragraph 4, 5th sentence is incomplete. It reads as follows "specific areas are to....." The author needs to check this sentence. b) Hypothesis: Only null hypothesis is provided. The author must provide an <i>Alternate hypothesis</i> for the study	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	c) In 2.0 the subtitle “ <i>Media channels and preference by farmers</i>” must be deleted. The whole section can then be added to the introduction. Methodology The author needs to provide subheadings as follows: a) First paragraph must be given a heading – Description of study areas b) Second paragraph must be given a heading – Sampling approach Observation: agricultural zones are indicated as A, B, C and D. there is no map, which shows the location of these zones or why there were labelled as so? Observation: second paragraph, first sentence –provide an abbreviation of Local Government Areas as (LGAs) as you have used this abbreviation later without providing it in full. Results and discussion a) The author must consider separating results and discussion. They are mixed up and confusing at the moment. b) It is stated that data was analysed using descriptive statistics and logit regression model. There is no indication that this was used as no summaries of data in the form of charts and bar graphs etc is provided, which are methods used in descriptive statistics. c) The application of logit regression must be reviewed, with results explained in a better way. At the moment there is a repeated reference to correlation –how were these correlations determined? d) There are number of explanations and references to existing literature that is provided under results.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	These need to be moved to discussion. e) A sample of a questionnaire used must be added as an appendix. This will help in understanding questions that were asked and data that was collected. Observation: Most of the information presented under results and discussion can easily be summarised and provided as tables. The author must consider reworking this section. Conclusion and recommendation The conclusion is very scanty and it lacks scientific vigour. It needs to be reworked. Ethical issues: a) The author needs to indicate how the farmers were approached to participate in the project. b) The author must indicate if the study obtained any ethical approval/clearance before it was conducted. If so by who. c) It will be important to indicate if farmers were given feedback on the study and how this has benefited them as participants in the study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Thokozani Simelane</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Science and Technology, Human Sciences Research Council Institute for Systems Science, Durban University of Technology, Durban, South Africa</i>