

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_104598
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Income Sources and Food Security Status in Haor Regions of Kishoregonj District
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, an important and relevant article, as reporting on the economic and food issue of northeast India, knowledge and what is happening in the region becomes important for society.</p> <p>The title is adequate bringing clarity of the subject addressed.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is understandable and consistent with the context addressed.</p> <p>Structure of the work is adequate with very relevant contexts.</p> <p>The work appears to be scientifically correct, after all the author reported the facts ethically, but lacking the approval of the ethics committee. Up-to-date and secure references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is adequate, clear and easy to understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Congratulate on relevant work. Field studies always give us very important information about what is happening at the present time.</p> <p>1 – INSERT THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THE WORK AT THE END OF THE INTRODUCTION</p> <p>2 – IN THE METHODOLOGY, INSERT TYPE OF STUDY, APPROACH, INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA. What is the problematization of the study?</p> <p>3 – IN THE REFERENCES INSERT THE DOI OF EACH ARTICLE FOUND AND THE DATE OF ACCESS.</p> <p>4 – AS THE WORK IS A FIELD STUDY, IF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL IS NECESSARY, FOR A SAFE PUBLICATION.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>As the work is a field study, if the ethics committee approval is necessary, for a safe publication.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mônica Barbosa de Sousa Freitas
Department, University & Country	Florida Christian University, USA