

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_127551
Title of the Manuscript:	Re-examine the relationship between the climatic factors and rice yield in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This publication is important to the scholarly community because it examines the complex relationship between rice yield and climatic conditions, which is a crucial issue for Bangladesh's food security. By concentrating on a long-term dataset (1990–2020), it offers important insights into how agricultural productivity is affected by climate variability, especially in an area that is extremely vulnerable to climate change. Policymakers can use the data to help create flexible plans to reduce climate risks and guarantee sustainable farming practices. The manuscript's specific approach to a significant global issue makes it especially compelling, yet comparisons to other areas dealing with comparable problems could increase its generalizability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The article's abstract is thorough and gives a concise synopsis of the main conclusions, study goals, and methodology. To provide readers a clearer idea of the study's breadth, it may be enhanced by specifically stating the particular meteorological variables examined and their noted effects on rice yield. Its relevance and appeal to a wider audience would also be increased by adding a succinct remark on the findings' implications for policy or real-world applications. Readers from a variety of backgrounds may find the abstract easier to understand if excessively technical elements are removed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriate for the topic and are well-organized. Understanding the research is made easier by the logical progression from the introduction to the methodology, findings, and discussion. Clearer titles, though, would help some parts better highlight important ideas or conclusions. Repetitive material in some subsections, if any, should be condensed to preserve clarity and focus. All things considered, the structure successfully advances the goals and plot of the text.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript's exacting methodology, thorough data analysis, and conformity to accepted theories in the field all support its scientific soundness. The authors ensure transparency and repeatability by providing thorough explanations and relevant statistical support for their findings. The background and importance of the study are further validated by the incorporation of pertinent literature. The manuscript's extensive analysis of potential constraints, which guarantees a fair and comprehensive explanation of the findings, demonstrates its robustness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The manuscript's extensive list of references, many of which are current and pertinent to the subject, offers a strong basis for the investigation. They contextualize the research within the existing body of knowledge and provide strong evidence for the claims. Nevertheless, adding any new research or significant works that have been released in the past year that the writers may have missed could improve the text even more. Specific gaps or missing references should be noted specifically for consideration if they are found.	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's language quality is typically appropriate for academic communication, with concepts explained in a clear and succinct manner. However, a few portions could use some modification due to minor grammatical, wording, or clarity concerns. Readability and accuracy will be increased by making sure that terminology is consistent, enhancing sentence structure, and fixing small typographical errors. To further improve the manuscript, a language editor's meticulous proofreading or review is advised.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This book adds significant insights to the discipline while addressing a contemporary and pertinent topic. The writers have provided a sound approach and analysis, backed up by unambiguous findings. Nonetheless, general readability and engagement would be increased by strengthening the narrative flow in specific portions (such as the introduction and end).</p> <p>To help readers who are looking for a rapid overview, the writers can also think about using a graphical abstract or summary picture to visually depict important findings. The impact and readability of the text could be further increased by making an effort to incorporate examples or real-world implementations of the research findings.</p> <p>Overall, this work has the potential to be a significant addition to the scientific community with just minimal revisions.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>E. Murali</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Siddhartha Institute of Science and Technology, India</p>