



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24637
Title of the Manuscript:	Shrimp Farmers' Usage and Preference of Extension Communication Media in Selected Areas of Bagherhat 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This article focus on media usage among shrimp farmer. The focal construct of this article is media usage but the author emphasized more in term of shrimp farming. Thus, this contribute to: 1. Lack of detail discussion in term of media usage in problem statement and fail to address gap issues in the area of issues. 2. Literature review need to discuss in detail variables studied, not on shrimp farming. Detail literature on media usage should be discussed. 3. Theory and theoretical framework should be added to strengthen the paper. Probably the author can also proposed few hypotheses. 4. In methodology section, provide population, sampling method, measurement and reliability and validity of the instruments. 5. Discussion should be more analytical and critical. 6. Implication toward policy and contribution to communication area should be discussed.	1. Introduction improved see line 15-23 2. Not addressed as reviews are discussed in result section 3. Theoretical framework added line 53-72 4. Discussion section improved see yellow shaded texts in discussion section 5. Difficult to address policy recommendation as the sample is very small and geographical coverage is very limited.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Good article but lack of discussion in the area of study	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		