Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAEES_36873**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Farm and Non-farm Income Diversification in Selected Areas of Sunamganj District of 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Be consistent, you used rural households, sampled households, respondents, person, farmers, holding to describe the same subject: your sampled farmers. The similar case for % and percent as well as the number of digit behind comma. Please choose one way to presenting it and stick to it. 2) How did you select your respondents? Explain further on your convenient sampling technic as it implies on the level of objectivity and reliability of your study. Is there any scientific reason for why did you choose Noagaon and Bahadurpur villages? How did you select respondents for FGD? Are they key informants, proportion on gender/age/level of education/etc.? When did you do your FGD, prior or after your interview period? Make sure that others can follow your method in the future. Add a sub-section entitled "Sampling technique". 3) You could consider simplifying your Result section. a) Section 3.1 Occupational Pattern, it is sufficient to mention the majority of your findings (the highest and lowest percentage of occupation, Line 143-146). b) Consider to delete section 3.3.1 Functional Relationship. Table 3.3 is better way to explain your model. c) Merge section 4.3.3 (it should be 3.3.3) Measures of the Proportion of Variation Explained with section 3.3.2 Model Specification for Quantitative Analysis, make the new row in Table 3.3. 4) Enrich your Discussion. You could consider to add: a) The limitation of your sampling technique and its implication, i.e. generalization of the results. b) Regarding Sub section 3.1 Occupational Pattern, we missed the explanation on why 25% farmers were doing cultivation+fishing+non-farm. How was the access of farmers to the land? Were those 25% households in a productive age in relation with their ability to diversifying income? You could discuss several factors that may influence your findings. c) It is fine to focus only on the significant variables (age and farm size), but it will increase the impact of your study if you could discuss the effect of other dependent variables as well, i.e why did access to credit and membership status negatively related to income diversification?. Find reference(s) with similar or adverse sign (positive or negative relation) on your dependent variables. 5) Line 293-295, be careful on drawing your conclusion. Economic growth does not always positively correlated with sustainability.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Language editing is necessary 2. Readers wanted to see the general background and the context of the study in the introduction section, no need the high level of precision (says 17% instead of 17.22%, 46% instead of 45.6%, about 15 million households instead of 15,183,183, Line 44-48). 3. Line 31-36, simplify them into the common 5 (or in considerable number) types of non-farm activities in Bangladesh. 4. Explain in one sentence what do you mean by Haors and Baors as they are not English term. Similar case for Rabi season (Line 52). 5. Line 45, total household is higher than number of population? 6. Line 47, are not rice, wheat, vegetables, spices cash crops? 7. Line 82, is it an aim or recommendation (under conclusion section) as the outcome of your study? 8. Help the readers to understand your study in a comfortable way: Line 124, S.S.C	

	and H.S.C?; Line 132, PRA – Participatory Rural Appraisal?; Line 219, FGD – Focus Group Discussion? 9. Line 166 and 167 are repetition of Line 103-107. Delete. 10. Line 215, similar with (Reference) 16? Elaborate a bit more such as where the previous study took place, etc.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Nayu Nuringdati Widianingsih***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Copenhagen, Denmark***