



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_43006
Title of the Manuscript:	FARMERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS HARMFUL EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON AGRICULTURE
Type of the 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	In the title of the paper the study area i.e. Bangladesh was missing and it should be included. Otherwise it is not clear from the title that where the study was done. In abstract also it was missing. - Under methodology, table of sample distribution showed the sample size as 109, but in abstract and under the section of 'collection and processing of data' it was mentioned as 113. So it is confusing about the sample size. - In reference section, check for Kabir 2002, it is not in alphabetical order.	It is not mendetory to mention the location in the title that is why Bangladesh is not included in the title. However I am agree that it should be mentioned in the abstract. Now it is mentioned in the abstract. - Corrected. Now the sample size is 113 and it is showed in all places. - Corrected. Reference was arranged according the journal style.
Minor REVISION comments	- In text % should be written as per cent, but within bracket it can be written as % - After decimal two digits should be written, eg. 15.60 not 15.6 - It is not specifically mentioned about dominant age group, income, farm level of the respondent in the discussion part. The author wrote as low to high, small to marginal etc. But instead of it he or she can specifically write highest respondents are middle aged, small farmers etc. as mentioned in table 2. It will give clear picture about the respondents. - In table 3, respondent per cent for lower agreed was written as 18.80 percent while in text it was shown as 18.60 percent. Kindly check it. - In 242 line, it should be 2012 not 20012	- Not agreed becasue in case of text, in the middle of sentence % can be used and there are availble reference of this style. - Followed - Followed - Followed - Followed
Optional/General comments	I feel that methodology part could be shorter. It is not needed to explain each section so elaborately. It should be clearly but precisely written. Only important analytical tools, formula etc should be written in details.	Agreed