

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_104516
Title of the Manuscript:	Trend Analysis and Prediction of Cropped Area of 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:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>To some extent</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>To some extent</p> <p>To some extent</p> <p>The references used in the article are not recent and enough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The temporal and spatial scope of the research should be clearly included in the abstract - The introduction section is very short and brief and the statement of the problem is poorly mentioned. Ambiguities are not correctly indicated - It is customary to Setting up LITERATURE REVIEW in the article - In the methodology section, the method of analysis and data analysis is also discussed, and the validity of the research is also examined. - It is better to make a general edit before printing. - It should be noted contribution of this article - The conclusion section has no detailed explanation. Also, no comparison has been made with the results of previous research mentioned in this research - Follow the general format of writing a scientific article 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahdi Filsaraei
Department, University & Country	Hakim Toos Higher Education Institute, Iran