



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_35433
Title of the Manuscript:	ATTITUDE TOWARDS WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN COOCH BEHAR DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL, INDIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 7-9: It is not attractive sentence. Would you please replace with more appropriate and subjective sentence for introduction? Line 11: It is not clear for the reader. It should be improved to abstract standard and revised. Line 12-14: It is not appropriate to define the term in abstract section so please cut from hear and paste in the introduction section. Line 16: Please include the methodology part of the study before the result? Line 16-17: How many percent? Include the results in number here? Line 18-20: The conclusion and recommendation were not clear. Please try to target you objectives above? Line 27-30: The definition about watershed development need further detailed definition about the approach. Line 32: What is positive attitude? Line 38-40: It needs citation here? Line 41-43: Does this objective similar with the one in abstract? Line 47: Please include a section called site description? Provide information for the readers to understand about the study site. Include information such as location, biophysical characteristics of the study area, population, socio economic data etc. Line 48-50: This section need to be deleted, it is unnecessary. Line 53: why not randomly selected respondents? What about the non-beneficiary farmers in the watershed? Are the 60 respondents are representatives? If yes, by which method you have confirmed their representation and how many percent was the representation? Line 54-55: Where are the controls and the treatments in this section? Need clear	The whole paper is revised as per the suggestions given; tables are incerted in the stipulated places; citations are added wherever needed. Methodology has been elaborately explained in revised paper; map and geographical position of the study area is mentioned.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	description about these two. Line 84: Table 1 should be presented in the result section to make it reader easily understand and compare the result. Watershed villages? What does it mean? Line 85: It was written twice and needed re-writing the whole sentence. Line 84-89: Need to be written in summarized. Line 114: Where it is? Please put it up in the above sentence? Line 121-123: The discussion section should be supported by using references. Line 124: where is it? Line 142-144: It is not studied by this research so need to be supported by reference. Line 163-167: Expansion of cultivable areas? This was wrong with the aim of watershed management definition and practically. It needs revision of this section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has mentioned important issue in natural resource management sector however it need revision in order to provide full information for the readers.	