



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_65102
Title of the Manuscript:	DRYLAND FARMERS ON CLIMATE RESILIENT PRACTICES – AN ADOPTION STUDY AT AN INDUSTRIALIZED TALUK OF TAMIL NADU
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	I. Introduction 1.1. Theoretical framework 2.3. Data collection methods and Analysis: Face to Face interview method 3. Results and Discussion 4. Conclusion	I. resilient: define this word. You can also remind the convention of 1992 (Rio Del Janeiro) on the conservation of biodiversity at the introduction. 1.1. I want you to clarify the specifics objectives of your work. 2.3. I think that it is better to said: direct interview method and then, you have to give the author' name responsible of this method. 3. you should choose 3 or 4 independent variables with that to establish the Relationship of Adoption of climate resilient practices. So, yours results are not enough argue. 4. You don't need to put any results or discussion at the conclusion, so removed all the sentences colored on yellow and put them at the discussion.
Minor REVISION comments	1- Methodology: The study used face to face interview 2- Results: While, some of the practices like incorporation of residues.....cust insurance were adopted to some extent.	1- You have to change this sentence and use the correct word 2- This sentence is too long trying to reduce it
Optional/General comments		Your work is very good in general and I think that, if you integrated all the corrections made by the reviewers, it will be one of the best publications.



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Madountsap Tagnang Nadege</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Douala University, Cameroon</i>