



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_52727
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved Vegetable Cultivation Practices: An Adoption Study Among the Farmers' of Some Selected Areas in Bangladesh
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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript seems to provide a great number of variables that try to explain why or why not the farmers are adopting “improved vegetable cultivation practices”, that might be very interesting for the decision-makers. However, more information is needed in order to understand the results, especially the questions made or which are those “improved vegetable cultivation practices”. The manuscript needs to face some issues before being considered for publication.</p> <p>My main concern is the lack of references: there are only 5, all of them from 2013, or even older. And all are in the introductions section, meaning that no discussion at all has been made! You need to discuss your results, otherwise they have no meaning, and reader will not understand their implications and their scope. The introduction content is fine, but you include many information and especially data without reference, and this is unacceptable.</p> <p>In the Materials and Methods section please take into account that it is an international journal, so you have to better locate your study area (a location map or the coordinates are a good idea), and provide some socioeconomic information about the area (number of inhabitants, main activities, proportion of land under crops, etc.).</p> <p>So many times the authors give no enough information about the variables they have measured, but in this case there is too much unnecessary information. The way you calculated variables described from 114 to 126 is rather obvious, everybody knows that age is “measured by counting the years from his birth to the time of interview”. The other more elaborated variables (i.e., knowledge, media contact, organizational participation, innovativeness, training experiences and problems in adoption) are well explained, but you have to provide the complete interview (as a supplementary material) in order to better understand how they were evaluated. And neither in results they are even mentioned. For example, in lines 193-194: which aspects do you mean? We have no idea because we do not know which were your questions, and you are not discussing them.</p> <p>Section 3.2. In Materials and Methods you did not mention these statistical analyses. You need to indicate which test did you run and which statistical software did you use. And it is unclear what are you testing here. For example, columns 5, 6, 7 and 8... they are the regression adjustment of what? All the variables together? It is hard to know if we do not know which test was done.</p> <p>Results. Lines 166-169 are actually part of Materials and Methods, and are fine to see all the variables that were measured.</p> <p>All legends must be self-explanatory. And there is no need, in table 1, of saying the possible range of variables; when needed, it was already indicated in Materials and Methods.</p> <p>Please pay attention to the writing and editing. There are many awkward sentences. For example, sentence in line 49 (“Better provide a reference regarding intake of kilo calories per day per person which is less than minimum requirement”) looks more like a comment may by a supervisor and included in the text by mistake than an intended one.</p> <p><b>Please use the International System of Units.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marina Mazón</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional de Loja, Ecuador</b>