



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_40906
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perception on constraints in adoption of double cropping in Upper Brahmaputra Valley Zone of Assam
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>)

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	<p>The study is intended to determine what are the obstacles to the practice of double cropping. Because of the fact that this article was designed to identify the socio-economic constraints and problems in adoption of double cropping. At this study 120 farmers were used by face to face survey techniques.</p> <p>Actually it was main problems about the farming system how to apply this sowing. And especially because of many constraints such as irrigation, machinery and marketing, this double cropping did not apply properly.</p> <p>At this study, 11 constraints were presented as problems of double cropping during the adoption. And they gave some results only frequency and rank values. It is not enough this summing values. It should be scientific pictures.</p> <p>I mean that it was so simple. It was necessary which is the most important as statistically. Is there a correction between them? I could not see from the results.</p> <p>I think if they develop using many methods with this figures, it can be acceptable more easily.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment As suggested by the reviewer, constraints are ranked based on statistical method rather than frequency and percent analysis.</p> <p>Regards</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		