



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_48347
Title of the Manuscript:	A Scale to Measure Farmers' Risk Perceptions about Climate Change and its Impact on Agriculture
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No major correction has been noted 	I have read the comments of the Reviewer and accordingly modified the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two last sentences under the abstract could be transferred to the section of introduction. Thereafter, a statement on the outcome of computation of reliability and validity of the scale should be presented. In other words, what was the level of precision and consistence of the scale. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good paper. However, the consideration of under listed observations may add value to the paper: The purpose and objective of the study does not answer the question "so what?". The twenty statements could be categorised into 4-5 major themes as sub-headings such as the level of understanding on or awareness of the climate change/effect of climate change, food production, land degradation to mention a few. Explain as to why the new scale is better than the existing ones. In other words, state the kind of gaps or shortcomings the scale is trying to address. It may be prudent to briefly describe how and under what circumstances the scale can be applied 	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	