

Editor's Comment:

I have now read the paper and the comments, I think it is acceptable.

It does not want much, just describe agricultural processes in Bangladesh, and it succeeds for this aim.

I have some minor remarks:

Page 1, title page:

Aims: the present study highlights/highlighted (not "was highlighted")

Study design: The study considered post-harvest losses (not "were accomplished post-harvest losses", which really does not make sense)

Results: was greater than for lemon (not "that the farmers for lemon")

Section 2.3.2:

The following modified formula (??? No formula follows here)

Section 2.3.5:

...important efficiency criteria (not "parameters", which is to be avoided as it is ambiguous)

Conclusion 4:

...was affected by insects, rot and unscientific method (not "rotten").

Editor's Details:

Dr. Robert Mauritius Kunst
Professor of Economics, University of Vienna, Austria