



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_28172
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Public Fisheries Extension Service on the Selected Socioeconomic Aspects of the Clients in Two Selected Sub-districts under Barisal 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 his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In this manuscript data was collected in a well structured interview schedule from 140 randomised fish farmers. In abstract part data collection period seems between 1 October and 28 October 2015 whereas in materials and methods part this range is between 11 October and 30 October 2015 which one is correct? In materials and methods part it is clear that this study evaluated the effect of public fisheries extension service comparing 70 randomised fish farmers related with public fisheries extension at least one year and 70 randomised fish farmers apart from public fisheries extension at least one year for the selected 8 unions under Barisal Sadar and Babuganj Upazila in Barisal District. However in the main text it is not clear that the authors evaluated the effect of public fisheries extension service comparing the two districts or the related public fisheries and non related public fisheries. This paradox should be clarified in the manuscript. There should not be any contradiction in the text. The backbone part of a scientific research paper is the discussion part. The data evaluated in a paper should be comprehensively discussed with the other scientific papers. In this manuscript discussion part should be rewritten because of the above reason. The statistical test applied to the gained data is non parametric statistics whereas it is determined in the manuscript that parametric statistical test may be more	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	effective to reveal the situation. In conclusion considering the reasons given above there are major deficiencies in this paper. If the authors take in consideration the main problematic parts of the manuscript, make the necessary corrections in the ms and rewrite and revise the text carefully.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Akasya Topçu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Ankara University, Turkey</i>