



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_46969
Title of the Manuscript:	LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF OBA AKOKO, AKOKO SOUTH WEST LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 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>)

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	<p>1. Reorganized the paper as follows: Abstract; Introduction; Literature Review (if cannot be incorporated in the Introduction); Methods; Results and Discussion; Conclusions and Recommendations; and References.</p> <p>2. There is no need for the presentation of maps. Delete them.</p> <p>3. Data that were clearly presented in tables should not be repeated one by one in narrative. After presenting the results in table, there should in-depth analyses of such results. The results should also be discussed in reference or comparison with the findings of previous similar studies.</p>	<p>I have incorporated the " Results and Discussion". Conclusion and recommendations have replaced "Summary". I strongly believed, other arrangements are in order.</p> <p>Maps are essential tools in Geography, it usually fosters deeper description explanation and understanding concerning location and issues in Geographical enquiry. The analysis of the results are also in order and generally the discussions are o.k. in its present state.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Check the year of publication of the reference authored by Agagu. Is it 2005 (line 57) or 2004 (line 270).</p> <p>2. The citations Diso (year?), Yahya 2009, and Ogidiefa 2010 (line 76) should be included in the list of references.</p> <p>3. Check the year of publication of the reference authored by Galvin. Is it 2003 (line 82) or 2009 (line 278).</p> <p>4. In line 133, "Socio-Characteristics" should be "Socio-Economic Characteristics".</p> <p>5. In the discussion after each table, only the percents may be indicated (and simply give the highlights of the results) and not anymore the frequencies, since those were clearly presented in the table. (See also compulsory revision comment no. 3 above)</p>	<p>This has been addressed, i.e. 2005.</p> <p>This has been addressed, i.e. (Ajayi, K.et.al. (2000).</p> <p>Addressed. It is 2009.</p> <p>Addressed.</p> <p>I strongly believe that the discussions is very o.k., it is good in its present state.</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	