



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_26007
Title of the Manuscript:	Vulnerability of Agricultural Production due to Natural Disaster at Mongla, Upazila (Sub district) in 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	1. Rework your abstract and connect all the elements together to form a whole. Summarize the abstract as briefly as possible and reconstruct some sentences that are not clear 2. Use your own sentences to present literatures cited, and not as it was originally presented by previous authors 3. Your conclusion looks more like the methodology. Can you use rework this part to summarize your work? Let this also be in agreement with your abstract. The author should be able to restructure sentences used from previous authors	1. Revised and rewrite abstract and have tried to connect all the elements together. Abstract has been rewritten as summarise and briefly also reconstruct the sentence where it was gap. 2. Literature section has been corrected specially citation and sentence rewritten as our own style where it was necessary. 3. Finally the correction of conclusion has been done according to the prudence reviewer comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Check your references section, some references are not consistent with the journal's format -There are some information you don't need in this manuscript, which unnecessary made it too busy. Narrow your report to basic issues and focus of your study and reduce the length	- Reference format has been changed and follow the journal format and inconsistent and unnecessary reference has been discarded. - It has been discarded some unnecessary information from manuscript which made it too lengthy, like the 2.2: Soil Condition, and 2.3: Climatic Condition.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a good study	