SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAF_46067**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE: PRESENT STATUS AND CROPPING PATTERN FOLLOWED BY THE FARMS IN THE KHULNA REGION**
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	The authors aimed to investigate a) the current status of the agricultural system in Khulna region; b) Identify the pattern of cultivation in the study area; c) Identify the constraints and opportunities for the adoption of CA in the existing standard in the Khulna region; and d) suggest some policy guidelines to popularize CA. In this sense, I have several concerns about this text, mainly regarding the methodology and consistency of the data. The results presented have very high coefficient of variation values (sometimes> 100%), which shows inconsistency of the data to meet the objectives; do not support the discussions, nor the conclusions. I recommend that the authors better evaluate the work, mainly in the methodological and statistical aspects of the data. It is important to redo the tables, inserting more descriptive statistics, such as Median, Asymmetry, Curtosis and Variation coefficient.	I try to follow this guideline and correct those error. Because the work had done so it was quite difficult to correct the methodology. But I didn't what did the respected said about this coefficient of variation, because I didn't find which values were indicated by him.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	