



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_48177
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmer's Constraints for Vegetables Marketing in 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>There are some major problems with this paper. There is no literature review and no use of references – the list of references included at the end of the paper is irrelevant since the references involved are not listed in the paper. There is no formal research question or hypotheses or conceptual framework – the paper is presented more in the form of a consultancy or market research report rather than an academic paper. There is no discussion section where the claim for contribution to academic knowledge can be made. The conclusion should incorporate the research limitations and the suggestions for further research.</p> <p>However, the biggest problem is with the methodology. The author claims to be using the Yamane equation and yet the numbers provided make no sense. What level of confidence is being used? Why has the sample been calculated on another sample rather than the population? How was the questionnaire designed and tested? What language was used? How were questionnaires distributed and returned? What is the possibility of non-response bias?</p> <p>The paper also needs to be checked for language use. The findings section is confusing. The demographic characteristics of the sample should be compared with that of the population.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Walsh
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Management, RMIT, Vietnam