



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_47108
Title of the Manuscript:	How do crop adaptation reduce impact of drought and mitigate food insecurity in Bangladesh? A case study on adoption of BUdhan1 rice variety
Type of the 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"> The conclusion must be fine-tuned as highlighted in the main text. The figured in the pie chart on page 7 should be expressed in percentage (for instance, 28.74%, 9.25%-----) Isolated cases of grammatical errors and spacing should be corrected. 	<p>Conclusion has been corrected</p> <p>Grammatical errors corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor errors have been highlighted in yellow and proposed changes in red 	Corrected
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may be necessary to review the title of the paper because the whole text is about adoption of a crop variety and not much on adaptation. In other words, there is a weak linkage between the text and the title. Improve section 3.6 on page 9 as highlighted Table 9 may not be necessary the results can be presented in a statement form in the main text. In Table 2, the basis/parameters for scoring/assessing the knowledge level can be expressed in a statement form rather than in question form which keeps the results in a raw form (appear as if, it is still in data form). For example , ability to name two drought tolerant varies-----. Otherwise, it is a good paper based on good methodology. 	All corrections have bee done and implemented in the MS

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)	