

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_119993
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Product Consumption: A Rural Women's Perspective
Type of the Article	

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 issues revealed in the manuscript are related to the consumption of environmentally friendly products related to the SDGs theme which is currently being widely discussed in various scientific studies. The manuscript contributes to the scientific community in the field of economics, especially macroeconomics and the environment</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate and describes the content and is brief</p> <p>The article abstract is too long, presented more concisely and added implications/recommendations from the research results</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. No Literature review and research hypothesis development section. The methodology section should be a method that covers more completely the process and stages of the research carried out, including estimation model specifications and statistical tests. The conclusions do not include study limitations and suggestions for future research agendas</p> <p>Scientifically, the manuscript has not been shown to be a scientific work of good quality. In the introduction. The research results are not discussed further in a separate subsection, namely Discussion</p> <p>References are woefully inadequate and should be supplemented with current and relevant sources. The following papers are recommended as additional references: Susanti, E., Marisa. L.H., & Endri, E (2022). Determinants of sustainable consumption: Moderating role of pandemic fear. <i>Innovative Marketing</i>, 18(4), 123-132. doi:10.21511/im.18(4).2022.11</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of articles in language/English needs to be adapted to good scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Endri Endri
Department, University & Country	Universitas Mercu Buana, Indonesia