

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_113031
Title of the Manuscript:	Job Satisfaction of the Sub Assistant Agricultural Officers in Dinajpur District of Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of agricultural extension and job satisfaction. The study investigates the job satisfaction of Sub-Assistant Agricultural Officers (SAAOs) in Bangladesh, a significant group contributing to the agricultural sector. The findings, discussing factors influencing job satisfaction, the significant role of perceived colleagues' support, job performance, psychological well-being, and organizational support, can provide valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners in the agricultural domain 2. Yes, provided the title is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the key aspects of the research, including the objectives, methods, and major findings. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and follows a logical flow. 5. yes, it is scientifically correct. 6. Yes the references sufficient and recent. 7. The abstract could benefit from a brief concluding statement summarizing the key findings and emphasizing their significance. This would provide a clear takeaway for readers. 8. The Abstract needs to be short, no need to specify how the measured Job satisfaction (more details in the method section needed) 9. Consider reorganizing the information in the introduction to improve the flow and make the transition between topics smoother. 10. Some points are reiterated throughout the introduction. For example, the significance of agriculture in the economy is repeated in various forms. Consider consolidating these points to avoid redundancy and maintain conciseness. 11. The specific objectives of the study are outlined towards the end of the introduction. It might be beneficial to introduce these objectives earlier to give the reader a clear roadmap for what to expect in the study. 12. The use of a multistage random sampling technique is mentioned, but details on the rationale for selecting specific upazilas and the representativeness of the sample about the entire Dinajpur district are not thoroughly explained. 13. The pretesting of the interview schedule is briefly mentioned, but the specifics of the pretest results, adjustments made, and how they influenced the final instrument are not detailed 14. The study period is outlined as from October 1 to December 31, 2020, but there is no discussion of why this timeframe was chosen or if there were any potential limitations associated with conducting interviews during this period. 15. While the study evaluates sixteen personal and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, there is limited discussion on why these specific characteristics were chosen and how they contribute to the understanding of job satisfaction among SAAOs. 16. The JDI is mentioned, there is no explanation of the scale used, its interpretation, or how it contributes to understanding dissatisfaction. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article generally meet the standards for scholarly communication. However, there are a few instances where sentence structures could be refined for better clarity and coherence. Some sentences are complex and might benefit from simplification.</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:	Sina Eslamdoust
Department, University & Country	Southern Illinois University, USA