



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26019
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIOLOGICAL APPRAISAL OF POLITICAL CRIMES IN BENUE STATE
Type of the Article	Case study

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	Line 58 – The author cites Wikipedia, which is not an academic publication. More scholarly publication(s) should be used instead. Line 81 should end with a question mark Lines 151 – 161 – On visitors to Benue ... are not relevant to the study. It is not part of the history and culture of Benue and is not linked to the subject matter “political crimes”. Line 165 – delete “observed”. Line 166 – change “it” to “its”. Line 166 – 167 – delete “to make matters more complicated”. On line 215 – The author should state exactly which variant of conflict theory is most appropriate to the study. Lines 284 – 293 are muddled up. The author needs to state clearly that questionnaire was used for collection of quantitative data while interview and focused group discussion were used for qualitative data. Lines 291 – 293 – does not portray the intended meaning and as such should be re-written. Line 285 – “services” should be changed to “sources”.	Most of the corrections are effected in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The month (s) in 2010 when the field survey was conducted should be stated. Line 27 – Citing New Webster's dictionary definition of Politics is too elementary for scholarly article. Author should use more scholarly definitions from either journals or dictionary of political science.	Most of the corrections are effected in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 421 – “calls for concern in this study...” should be reviewed, what is the concern about? Line 529 – “The common among as the findings...” needs to be reviewed.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is a good one however that are some shortcomings that the author need to tidy up. In the abstract, the flow of the methodology section should be sample selection before administration of instrument and analysis. The descriptive statistics was done will data were presented using frequency tables and percentages. Interview and focused group discussions were included as methods of data collection in the abstract, while the findings and conclusion were merged. Findings should be stated separately before the conclusion.	