



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction The title of the research article is well phrased. Moreover, the research problem is not clearly stated, also the research objectives is not clearly narrated in this part. The introductory part should highlight at least every aspects pertaining to the objectives under the study. Similarly, the researcher should include a short literature review shown what other different scholars have reported based on his study topic. Methodology This part is well discussed. However, the following were not addressed; - <i>-The type of research design used-</i> <i>-Sample size justification</i> <i>- Criteria used for purposive selection of shrimp farmers</i>	1. Introduction section improved, see line 15-23, objectives added line 47-51, conceptual framework added 53-72 2. Sample size justified, see line 167-169 3. Criteria used for purposive sampling is mentioned, see line 169-171 Discussion part The suggested paragraph is improved, please see line 297-306



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion part This part is well discussed. Moreover, this part will be more appealing if you could maintain good flow of your ideas. This part should be discussed based on the specific objectives of the study. For example, line starting from 277 to 286 connection or flow of ideas to the rest of the other part is missing. Otherwise after those corrections the article is good and can be published.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		