



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_23881
Title of the Manuscript:	An Economic Analysis of Year Round Pangus Production and Social Impact in Some Selected Areas of Mymensingh District in Bangladesh
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
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>In general, the present manuscript: “An economic analysis of year round Pangus production and social impact in some selected areas of Mymensingh Bangladesh” addressed to:</p> <p>1) determine the cost and returns of Pangus fish production;</p> <p>2) assess socioeconomic and environmental impact of Pangus farming on livelihood and food security of farm households;</p> <p>3) suggest some policy implication for greater benefits on Pangus farming on livelihood and food security of farm households, it is interesting. On the other hand, there is necessity of improvement due to some mistakes, misunderstandings, and information lack in all sections of this manuscript (showed below). In addition, there are some spelling problems along the manuscript, and the English needs to be revised and improved. Besides, editing service is recommended, mainly to formatting in the text (according to guidance of the authors - http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors). Therefore, this current manuscript needs serious major revision.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	<p>Abstract section and Keywords</p> <p>1) Provide more results in this section, because, you have more important results than you added. In addition, example of mistake is about the abbreviations. The first time that the abbreviations was cited in the manuscript, describes the meaning, later, you need to abbreviate. Some example, “TK.”. The review of the entire manuscript is necessary. Furthermore, in the present study a more solid conclusion is required;</p> <p>2) Line 8-9: provide complete address (like, state, country);</p> <p>3) Keywords? Provide Keywords.</p> <p>Introduction section</p> <p>1) The Introduction section is short and could be further explored in relation to Pangus fish aquaculture, and focusing on the importance of this study. It is necessary to provide these information's in Introduction section, showing which gap you are filling with your work as well as its importance. Please, provide it?</p> <p>2) Line 26: provide scientific name of “Pangus fish”;</p> <p>3) Correct the presentation form of the references along the manuscript. According to guidance of the authors, in the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets. The review of the entire manuscript is necessary;</p> <p>4) Standardize the presentation of the metric unit</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>(mt or MT, line 37-38).</p> <p>Methodology of the study</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Correct the presentation form of the tables; 2) Provide complete address of the present study (state, country). If possible, total size in area of Konabari and Baganbari villages; 3) Provide the source of the table 1 or reference. If this data (table 1) is results of the present manuscript, move this table to Result section. Same comments applies to Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6; 4) Provide in “material supplementary” the questionnaire made to producers; 5) Provide references to “Cobb-Douglas production function model” and “theoretical model for food consumption”; 6) The first time that the abbreviations was cited in the manuscript, describes the meaning, later, you need to abbreviate. Move “Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations” (line 95) to line 93 (before the abbreviation “FAO”); 7) Remove the “bold” the following words: “food intake” (line 98); “nutritional status” (line 103); “total consumption”, “expenditures” and “or income” (line 106); and “vulnerability” (line 111); 8) What does this mean “BCR” (line 141)? Describe the abbreviation. <p>Result and Discussion section</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I do not see “Result” and “Discussion” section in the present manuscript. Provide these sections according to guidance of the authors.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Editing service is recommended in ALL REFERENCES!!! I advise the authors to follow the guidance of authors (mainly in the literature cited).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Renato Massaaki Honji</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Departamento de Fisiologia, Universidade de Sao Paulo Rua do Matao, Brazil</i>