

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_120662
Title of the Manuscript:	Driving Agricultural Transformation: Unveiling the Impact of Rural Livelihood Diversification Strategies in Bangladesh
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important given the relevance of the agricultural sector particularly for developing countries like Bangladesh. While the diversification of the activities at the rural area of the economy is highly advocated for, it is important to realize the importance of linkage between the farm and non-farm sector for a balanced economy. Hence, the study is timely.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is really suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is well written	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The researcher can add few empirical literatures that were reviewed in the course of the study. In section 3, include the p-values of the result for proper understanding and interpretation of the results.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust. The researcher (s) have been able to use appropriate estimation techniques in the estimation of the data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The refences are weak. The researchers should endeavour to use recent articles.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article requires proper editing. There are few grammatical errors that obstructs the flow of the reading.	
Optional/General comments	The researchers did a good work.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Evelyn Ogbeide-Osaretin
Department, University & Country	Edo State University, Nigeria