



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_49683
Title of the Manuscript:	ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDED FERTILIZER DOSE IN FARMER'S FIELD 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>)

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	<p>The research objectives need to be revised to keep the consistency with the results of the research, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To analyse relationship of the selected variables with the adoption of recommended dosages of fertilizers and innovations Reviewing the terms "farmer's attitude" is it appropriate for grouping farmers as adopters? (should it "classification of farmers as adopters of innovation") <p>Recommended fertilizer dosages and cultivated plants should be presented in Introduction.</p> <p>Rogers's theory (1961) mentions the categories of adopters are innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards, considering the time of adoption. Is the formula for measuring the ther members. What is the formula for measuring the extent of adoption only considers the land area of the use of recommended dosages of fertilizers? The time when farmers adopt it should also be considered</p> <p>The discussion of why the results of the study in subchapter 3.2, 3.3., and 3.4. were obtained need to be added.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Words within the objectives rearranged . Actually two aspects of adoption was the focus issue of this research: time dimension of adoption (i.e., innovativeness) and spatial dimension of adoption (i.e., land area under adoption). The focus issue was clarified in the places where necessary in the texts Recommended fertilizer dosages are very big issue with huge texts. It could be found in the fertilizer recommendation guides. References cited. Two aspects of adoption were clarified [time dimension of adoption (i.e., innovativeness) and spatial dimension of adoption (i.e., land area under adoption)]. Reasoning was tried to clarify. <p>Highlighted with yellow color</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 21, is written (966.7%), is it right?</p> <p>Re-check typo, for example typo the name of the author referenced in the bibliography</p>	<p>Corrected as per reviewer's comment and journal guidelines</p> <p>Highlighted with yellow color</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Line 112 and 113 are added units. (Why in decimal, better explain clearly)</p>	<p>Explained</p> <p>Highlighted with yellow color</p>



PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	I declare that there is no ethical issues in this manuscript