

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_124819
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Contributing to the Constraints Faced by Rural Women Regarding Their Livelihood
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important because it addresses critical socio-economic challenges faced by rural women, focusing on their livelihood and the role of microfinance. It contributes valuable data to understanding how constraints like high-interest rates, inadequate training, and delays in loan disbursement affect these women. I appreciate the comprehensive analysis, but some sections require better clarity for wider comprehension.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally suitable, but a more precise title could be: " <i>Socio-Economic Constraints Faced by Rural Women in Bangladesh: A Study on the Impact of Microfinance through PDBF.</i> " This title better reflects the content and focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from better organization and clarity. It should include key findings (e.g., percentages) to give readers a clearer summary of the results. Improving sentence structure and punctuation will also enhance readability. Additionally, highlighting the implications of the findings in the abstract would enhance its impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate and follow a logical flow. However, incorporating visual aids like charts and graphs would improve the presentation of data and make the results easier to interpret.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It uses a well-defined sample size and appropriate statistical methods (e.g., Pearson's correlation). The results are supported by reliable data, and the discussion effectively links the findings to broader socio-economic themes. This makes it a valuable contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly sufficient and recent, but incorporating a few more global studies on rural microfinance and women's empowerment would strengthen the literature review. This would provide additional context and enhance the manuscript's relevance to a broader audience.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality needs improvement. While the content is informative, there are grammatical errors, and punctuation issues that can hinder clarity and readability. A thorough proofreading to correct these issues is necessary to ensure clarity and meet scholarly communication standards.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript is relevant to the scientific community and offers valuable insights into rural women's socio-economic challenges in Bangladesh. It could be improved by including specific recommendations in the conclusion and integrating comparative analysis with similar global studies. Additionally, the presentation of results could be enhanced with visual data representations. While the study provides important findings, it does not sufficiently highlight areas for future research. For instance, future studies could explore how to optimize microcredit schemes or examine the long-term impacts of inadequate training programs.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically sound but requires improvements in language clarity, the abstract, and data presentation. I recommend a major revision to enhance its overall impact.</p>	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mafruha Binte Shameem
Department, University & Country	Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh