



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_50173
Title of the Manuscript:	Are Dairy Farmers of Haor Areas Food Secured?
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Major issues raised in this article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no clear argument or aims in this paper. Authors must clearly show in the introduction of the article what is the scope of the article: is it a gap in the literature or is it a case study following other studies. 2. The international (or its international impact) and even the regional relevance of the paper is missing in the introduction 3. The literature review of the paper is poorly addressed. Authors must include several other works published on food security in the world (see articles in specialised journals such as 'Global Food security', 'Food security', 'Agriculture and Food Security' etc) and connect it to their specific case. It is odd but there are no quotes of specific ideas launched by other authors on food security; in fact I noticed a quote in the introduction relating to FAO, 2002 but has no page referenced. Through addition of several quotes from different articles and/or book the current article would give rigor to this article 4. Methods do not show limitations of the study. What limitations would the methods used show? 5. The discussion must be better connected to the literature on food security. How the results of the authors are placed in comparison to other similar studies. 6. Conclusion must be developed with a phrase showing a more deep debate on the aims of the study and the follow-up research, meaning how other authors could develop the ideas of this article. 7. The abstract is a bit too detailed on figures as results. Also, authors could place a first sentence in the abstract revealing what we know on food security, what we learn from this study and where is this article positioned in the broad literature. <p>Some minor issues: The first statement of the article, where authors define food security, must be referenced. There are several issues of typos and proof reading needing: for instance is it "hoar" or 'haor'? Also, I think this word must be capitalised as Hoar/Haor. Sometimes we find one of it, sometimes the other. There are also other typos, mainly when using 'et al', it is not milching but 'milking' etc.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Cretan, Remus</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>West University of Timisoara, Romania</i>