

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_110795
Title of the Manuscript:	Problem Faced by the Small Enterprise Beneficiaries of Palli Daridro Bimochon Foundation: an Organization Work for Rural Development in Bangladesh
Type of the 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> <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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Investment in local SMEs will always be important for every local government, or an upazila in the case of Bangladesh. The manuscript is significant for the scientific community, particularly from a socio-economic investment and job creation point of view.</p> <p>The title is suitable. Titles are usually reviewed and approved by ethics committees. Any concerns with the title would have been raised during the ethics review.</p> <p>Please include the internal consistency/Cronbach Alpha in the abstract. The SELP acronym in the abstract needs to be defined.</p> <p>Appropriate.</p> <p>To some extent, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The reason for this is the chi-square distribution, Cronbach Alpha, and the specific literature for the statistics and the statistical treatment are missing.</p> <p>The manuscript needs language editing before finalization.</p> <p>Though some of the references are pretty old, it is understandable for a study of this nature. Therefore, the references may be somewhat insufficient due to the reasons mentioned in (5) above and the general comments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is ok. The manuscript could use language editing to improve the general quality of the language from ok to good. There was an unnecessary use of capitalization in the manuscript that the language editing application should pick up. The freeware language editing applications out there could do the trick here.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The writing style is interesting. The author(s) succeeded in unpacking the issues plaguing the four upazilas concerned. Palli Daridro Bimochon Foundation (PDBF), therefore, seemed the best bet to inject funds into the SME sector for growth purposes. It was also understandable that the banks would show little to zero appetite for supporting SME investment as is usually the case in many developing countries.</p> <p>The reader may not know what the SELP and GDP acronyms/abbreviations are as used in the manuscript. Therefore, these acronyms should first be written out and introduced as acronyms.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>In Table 2, 'sign' is spelled as 'sing'. Probably, originally misspelled from SPSS.</p> <p>Empirically, the chi-square (χ^2) distribution equals double the mean. Was there a specific reason for missing out on the χ^2 when discussing mean and standard deviation?</p> <p>The author(s) only included the Pearson coefficient of correction. That is, the test-retest reliability. Was there a specific reason for missing out on the internal consistency coefficient, that is, the Cronbach Alpha (α)? The α-value should also be reflected in the abstract. Statistically, the Pearson coefficient values are expected to be distributed between the ranges -1 and $+1$. The manuscript complies with these ranges. However, the overall discussion of the results is missing out on the literature specific to the statistics. The inclusion of such specific literature will talk specifically about the 'statistical treatment performed' and the reliability of the coefficient values.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Cecil Kgoetiane
Department, University & Country	Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa