



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_41781
Title of the Manuscript:	ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR OF THE RICE GROWERS AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE INDUCED FLASH FLOOD IN HAOR AREAS: EMPHASIZING ON THEIR SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRAITS
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	Title of Manuscript : "Adaptive Behavior of the Rice Growers Against Climate Change Induced Flash Flood in Haor Areas: Emphasizing on their Socio-Economic Traits" Date of Review : 9 May, 2018 The study is quite interesting but I have these few comments to make; The study investigated the adaptive behaviours of rice farmers against climate change induced flash flood in haor area in Bangladesh. Firstly, the title of this manuscript may be reconstructed as this "Adaptive Behaviours of Rice Farmers Against Climate Change Induced Flash Flood in Haor Areas in Bangladesh". The abstract was well presented but you may still add some major empirical findings in this study. The introduction was comprehensive and well presented. But as part of the introduction, the research objectives should probably lead to research questions. The statement of the problem of this study was not clearly presented or conspicuously missing. This should be given proper attention and should come up immediately after the introduction to really identify the gap this study is set to fill. Also, with this kind of study, you need to state some hypotheses which are conspicuously missing in this manuscript. You may have to explicitly state some hypotheses because most of the results in the results and discussion section was full of results of hypotheses testing that were actually conspicuously missing in this study. These may include both the null and alternative hypotheses (H_0 and H_1). The research methods were well analyzed with tables and figures well presented but requiring some formatting on the part of some tables. The discussion of the results of these research findings should be brief and concise, considering mainly the major findings while others details are contained in the tables used for the discussion. There may be a need to do some formatting for the tables used in this study for the purpose of clarity. The conclusion section should rather be "conclusion and Recommendations". The recommendations given at the later part of the conclusion should emanate from the research findings and not just mere generalization. The recommendations may be presented concisely in paragraphs with each recommendation contained in one paragraph and not in bullet points with no numbering.	
Minor REVISION comments	All the minor revision comments are already given in the original manuscript	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Olutosin A. Otekunrin</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>