Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_52974**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comprehensive Socio economic and Demographic profile of farm households in West Bengal, India**
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://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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	I would like to say that the topic is really an interesting one but I have some suggestions/comments to make with sole aim of improving the quality of the final publication. These are given below:	We have revised the manuscript and highlighted with Brown colour
	Starting from the title, I feel the word "Socio economic" should be written as one word "Socioeconomic". In the abstract, some of the vital ingredients of a well written abstract is conspicuously missing here. These include; The brief conclusion and at least one recommendation based on the findings of this study. I feel author(s) does not need to include many of the findings in this study but just the striking ones while other results are hidden in the main text and readers are encouraged to find them out.	The word "Socio economic" was replaced by "Socioeconomic". We made necessary changes in the abstract, which includes conclusion and recommendation etc.
	From the introduction, author(s) may need to include the hypotheses formulated in this study towards the tail-end of this section. Some results of tests of independence was presented in the results and discussion section but it was quite unbelievable that there were no hypotheses formulation and no presentations of such in the body of this manuscript. It is conventional that the Chi-Square test of independence should be formulated and presented before the results could be meaningful to your readers. The test should be in the form of both null (H_0) and alternative (H_1) hypotheses.	Null hypothesis (H_0) and Alternate Hypothesis (H_1) were included towards the tail end of the Introduction.
	In the methodology, some the tables presented after the brief discussion about them were somehow confusing to me. I feel author(s) stated that the total number of respondents used for this study was 600 but, some tables (1,4 and 5) was 3704. You may need to give some explanations about this disparity. Also, sampling procedures employed in this study was not included. Author(s) needs to include how you arrived at your 600 respondents used for this study. You also encouraged to add the map of the study area in this section even though it is not compulsory but it adds colour to your work.	The total surveyed farm households in the study area are 600 and considering each household member in each farm household then the total population is 3704. Explanation has been given along with the sampling procedure.
	Furthermore, author(s) should always include the source of the tables or figures presented in this manuscript at the bottom of each of them.	Source of the tables presented at the bottom of each of them.
	In the discussion section, I did not really understand the way you compare the results of your findings in this study with the already existing empirical studies in literature. Author(s) really need to scientifically compare the results of this study with existing empirical studies either to support the results or refute them.	Here the variable are selected based on some existing empirical studies and the distributional pattern of the major characteristics are similar to those existing empirical studies
	With this kind of study, I feel some recommendations should emanate from the results of the findings. It is important for author(s) to include some of these recommendations immediately after the conclusion or may feel like merging both the conclusion and recommendations together (Conclusion and Recommendations).	Conclusion and Recommendations are modified and included.
	Lastly, I will employ the author(s) to include more current and relevant references (2016-2019) in this study to make this article relevant when published in 2019 or any other year deemed fit.	Employed relevant references

Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	