

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_124906
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING TEMPORAL PRICE BEHAVIOUR OF RICE IN BANGLADESH
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This study is timely not only for Bangladesh but also for the global scientific community, scholars, and business professionals. In the face of growing food insecurity and price volatility, it provides essential insights for making informed production decisions in both local and international markets. By offering data-driven guidance, this research helps stakeholders navigate market challenges and better understand price dynamics to support sustainable production and trade.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Timely and Relevant: The study addresses critical issues of food insecurity and price volatility, which are pressing global concerns. The focus on providing insights for both local and international markets is a valuable contribution.</p> <p>Global and Local Relevance: While the study is centered on Bangladesh, it extends its relevance to global audiences, making it beneficial for scholars, scientists, and business professionals around the world. This makes the research more versatile and applicable beyond its immediate context.</p> <p>Practical Applications: By highlighting the potential for making informed production decisions, the study offers practical solutions for addressing market challenges, which can support policymakers, farmers, and businesses alike.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>"Assessing Temporal Price Fluctuations of Rice in Bangladesh: Insights for Market Stability and Food Security"</p> <p>This title highlights the key focus areas—temporal price behaviour, the specific commodity (rice), and its relevance to broader issues like market stability and food security. It also hints at the practical implications of the study, which makes it more engaging for both academic and business audiences</p>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The abstract is overly brief, particularly in the sections covering the methods and results. We should consider adding more details, especially regarding the key findings, to enhance its comprehensiveness</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The current subsections and structure of the manuscript are not fully sufficient. Several areas require enhancement to ensure a more robust and cohesive presentation:</p> <p>1. Literature Review: The literature review section is lacking in depth. It should include a more thorough examination of what previous studies have found, particularly in relation to temporal price behaviour and rice markets. This will help to clearly identify the research gap that this study aims to address. Expanding on past scholarly works will also provide stronger context and justification for the study's significance.</p> <p>2. Discussion Section: The discussion section needs improvement in terms of connecting the current findings with previous research. It is important to compare and contrast the study's results with past studies, highlighting any consistencies, discrepancies, or new insights. This will enhance the scholarly value of the work and show how the research contributes to the broader academic discourse.</p> <p>3. Future Study Recommendations: The manuscript currently lacks recommendations for future studies. Including this section is essential as it helps outline the next steps in research, addresses any remaining gaps, and suggests areas for further exploration based on the current findings. This will also demonstrate</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>the ongoing relevance of the research topic.</p> <p>4. Study Limitations: There is no section discussing the limitations of the study. A well-rounded research manuscript should acknowledge any limitations, whether methodological or contextual, as this helps readers understand the scope and constraints of the study's findings. Including limitations will also enhance the credibility of the research by showing an awareness of its boundaries.</p> <p>5. Conclusion: conclusion is very brief, yet the study has brought a lot of issues</p> <p>Addressing these points will greatly improve the structure and depth of the manuscript, making it more comprehensive and academically rigorous.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness due to the clear alignment between its methodology, research aim, and conclusions. The methodology is well-detailed, ensuring that the study's processes are transparent and can be replicated by future researchers. Additionally, the major aim of the study is clearly defined, and the presentation of results is well-structured, offering meaningful insights that directly support the research objectives. The conclusion logically follows from the data and analysis, showcasing a well-thought-out approach that ties the findings back to the study's central goals. This overall coherence strengthens the scientific credibility of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are insufficient, primarily due to the gaps in the literature review and discussion sections. A more extensive review of recent and relevant scholarly works is needed to provide better context for the research and to position it within the broader academic discourse. Additionally, the discussion section should include references that relate the study's findings to previous research, which would help strengthen the manuscript's scholarly contribution.</p> <p>Moreover, there is no need for the authors to cite themselves in the tables and figures sections of the results. Since this is an original research study, the assumption is that all tables and figures were created by the authors unless otherwise indicated. Citations should only be included if the figures or tables were adapted or sourced from another study.</p> <p>Incorporating more recent references and removing unnecessary self-citations in the results section will enhance the scientific integrity of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YesMajor revision is intensively required</p> <p>The language quality of the article requires revision to meet the standards of scholarly communication. There are several grammatical issues and instances of awkward phrasing that need improvement. For example, phrases like "discussion about" should be simplified to just "discussion" to maintain concise and professional language. It is recommended that the authors seek the assistance of a technical English professional to ensure that the grammar and phrasing are accurate and polished throughout the manuscript. This will enhance clarity and readability, making the article more suitable for a scholarly audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Enock Siankwilimba
Department, University & Country	Graduate School of Business, University of Zambia, Zambia