

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_77467
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of climate change on milk production and perceptions of Farmers in the West Bengal
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment and of Farmers	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>(1) TITLE: Farmers' perceptions of climate impact on milk production and adaptation strategies in West Bengal</p> <p>(2) INTRODUCTION: No clear objectives or research questions are stated in this study. They shall be added.</p> <p>(3) RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: sub-sections 3.1 and 3.2 emanate from prediction models that are not clearly stated in the study. The authors are alluding to trends and significant levels that cannot be assessed from anywhere. If data are borrowed from a second-hand study, the authors shall be recognized; otherwise, there will be claims of plagiarism. If the authors of this study used modelling, then they shall display parameters' tables and/or trend graphs. Materials and methods shall also be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Finally, radar chart 2 (Figure 2) is wrong because it sums up seasonal temperatures to make the annual one (e.g. south 24 Parganas: Max Temp 60°C; min Temp 40°C). There is room for improvement.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There is a wrong interpretation of the radar charts (Figures 1 and 2) by using the trend analysis and its significant levels. They may not be the right tools, since they are just descriptive (but not predictive). The authors have a choice between the two methods (description or prediction), unless they demonstrate how they used both. There is also room for improvement of the English language</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Very good paper despite these few corrections</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Cush Ngongo Luwesi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Evangélique en Afrique (UEA), Republic of the Congo</b>