



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_19233
Title of the Manuscript:	An Overview of Drought Hazards and Prospective Mitigation Approach in Bangladesh
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	My opinion is that it has problems that you will have to consider to make it suitable for publication. You find below my comments of your paper: - The title of the paper is concise and informative. - The purpose of the work is not very clear, and the objectives need to be stated clearly. - Lines 8: "is now considerer to be a vital" ?? - Figure 1 is not readable and Title is too short. Try to extend it with useful information. The size of the characters is much too small—not readable in the present size but all names and numbers should be readable after the reduction for printing in the journal. - The introduction should include testable hypothesis and a little insight on methodology. - The authors may need to follow the general rule to write a logic and meaningful introduction. - Results: it was hard to follow. Try to reorder the data and give some possible utility of the outcome. - The study context (Drought Hazards) is very interesting. But, the outline of the text is not really suitable (yet?) to make a scientific article. Besides serious formal issues, it lacks a clear delineation of the study purpose, the methods, data (where are	Thank you for your constructive suggestion. It has been tried to more improve according to your valuable review points. However, it actually review article that's why a few number of comments was no scoped to implement in the manuscript like as methodological section etc. Thank a lot.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	they or are there any?) and results presentation. - Please check the manuscript carefully for the correction errors on : punctuation errors, some unclear sentences, - There are many spelling mistakes in the text, should be corrected. - Repetition could be observed in paragraphs - The conclusions must adequately tie together the other elements of the paper such as theory, data and critical perspectives. - Lot of statements require references	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		