

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_86003
Title of the Manuscript:	Economics of Women Involvement in Pineapple Production in Moulvibazar District, Bangladesh: Household Income and Decision Making Perspective
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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	The quality of the English language in the manuscript is not at an adequate standard for peer review. It is recommended having manuscript copy edited for language usage and grammar, for instance by a third party or a professional service.	First of all, the authors giving thank the reviewers for their valuable suggestions. Though we are new and young researchers and have no communication with any professional writers. So, at this moment we are trying to write by ourselves with our view and study context and also admitted that at this time it seems too simple but hopefully, we will try to perform better in near future. Moreover, we are trying to rewrite some portions again to maintain the standard of the manuscript. Thank you once again for your comments.
Minor REVISION comments	-Design of the study not clear -The length of the categories is unbalanced for the ages in table 1	In the section on material and methods, the study design was clearly notified and the categories were checked again according to the instruction.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has not provided with sufficient reporting details regarding -questionnaire used for data collection - rating scales absent in the manuscript	As providing a questionnaire was not mandatory here so the authors skip this step but if anyone needs this questionnaire, the authors can send it personally. To maintain the standard of the manuscripts authors only incorporated the analysis part with the relevant Table and omit the rating scale otherwise the manuscript would be too long and diminish the quality of publication.

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)	