



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17272
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers usage of agrochemicals in a maize based multi cropping system: a case study of Small holder Farmers in Ifedore local government area , Ondo 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 (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 manuscript on "Farmers usage of agrochemicals in a maize based multi cropping system: a case study of Small holder Farmers in Ifedore local government area , Ondo State, Nigeria" is well written, but it contains some flaws in presentation. Authors must take all suggestions into account. Abstract Line 16: "..to enrich the data being collected" I suggest you to write "..to enrich the collected data" It misses the keys words. Introduction Line 40-43: The sentence is incomprehensible. Line 46-50: the sentence is too long. Line 61: pesticides or insecticides? Lines 72-90: You can remove all these sentences and specify in a sentence the aim of the study. Methodology Line 97: What does "et ce tra" mean? Line 106: "the data being collected" I suggest you to write "the collected data" How were the data treated? Which software of data processing did you use?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results and discussion Line 119: you must remove “this is because” of the sentence. Lines 121-122: you repeated twice the same information. Line 124: You missed coma. Lines 180-182: incomprehensible Line 183: It misses coma. Line 197-202: why didn’t all the farmers know the use of agrochemical? You should provide more explanation. Line 210: It misses coma. Lines 211-212: This sentence need to be rebuilt. Lines 220-222: incomprehensible (many full stop making the sentences incomprehensible) Lines 247-252: The sentence is too long. Line 252-255: what is the link between the two sentences? Line 310-315: You must remove this heading and add this to conclusion.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claude Ahouangninou
Department, University & Country	University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin