

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_101474
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAINING NEED OF THE PINEAPPLE GROWERS FOR BOOSTING PRODUCTION IN HILLY AREAS OF SREEMANGAL UPAZILA UNDER MOULVIBAZAR DISTRICT
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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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)
<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>The manuscript is important for the scientific community</p> <p>The title of the manuscript can be coined as "DETERMINANTS OF TRAINING NEED OF THE PINEAPPLE GROWERS FOR BOOSTING PRODUCTION IN HILLY AREAS OF SREEMANGAL UPAZILA UNDER MOULVIBAZAR DISTRICT"</p> <p>The Abstract of the article is comprehensive but lacks recommendation</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Scientifically, some findings of this study are in conflict with literature. However, the author demonstrated how relevant the findings are in the area of study hence contributing to literature. Future studies may agree or disagree with the finding.</p> <p>Generally, most of the cited work is more than 10 years old. This generates fear that there could be some recent studies that were not captured but could be relied upon. May be the area is not vastly researched and the references in this manuscript can stand.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language is suitable for scholarly work	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper is generally good but can be improved. Future surveys can be improved by using a wider sample drawn from various areas within the country.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fexter Katungwe
Department, University & Country	Malawi