



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26249
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (IPM) PRACTICES BY THE FARMERS OF KALIA UPAZILA UNDER NARAIL DISTRICT
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 his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I think the authors must expand on describing why farmers have a less favourable attitude about implementing IPM practices. This is one of the most critical sources of information to reach conclusions about the next steps. The authors should contemplate to combine the findings described in "problems faced in IPM practices, "knowledge about IPM..." and "attitude towards IPM..." (lines 195 to 217) because all of them are highly connected and related. For instance, problems and attitude towards IPM is a reflexion of lack of knowledge. The authors could present a better perspective combining these three subsections in the results. One recommendation to the authors is to find an English-native colleague or highly proficient in English language for help in checking and correcting the English all along the manuscript. I found a number of mistakes that prevent a better understanding but I concentrated only in reviewing the science.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Again, the English has to be reviewed. Below a few things I found-- Line 78 replace "constants" with "constrains". Line 141. Just indicate 61.10% do not use "three fifth" as this is not a common standard way to report proportions. Line 168 please fix typo, you report that 25.24% twice by mistake.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an interesting survey that provides detailed information about the implementation and use of IPM practices in rural developments. This contributes to better understand how IPM is perceived and what is preventing expansion and acceptance. The authors did a good job identifying the regions and developing a proper experimental design.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA