



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_51252
Title of the Manuscript:	Decision Making Capacity and Constraints Faced by Rural Women while Seeking Maternal and Child Health Care Services in North Eastern Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The use of “maternal period” is ambiguous. Sentenced must be revised Line 17-18: correct sentence Line 21: what does MMR stand for? Abbreviations should be written in full in first use Line 67-71 & Line 76-79. The sampling procedures are contradictory. Purposive sampling is totally different from simple random sampling. The two cannot stand.</p> <p>Line 79-80. What is the probability that the sample drawn was representative of the total population of eligible women in the village? Do the villages have the same population size? If the population size is not the same or near the same, selecting 30 participants in each village is not an appropriate procedure to achieve a representative sample.</p> <p>This is a study involving human beings. According to the declaration of Helsinki, all studies involving human participants should be reviewed by an institutional review board. However, nowhere in the manuscript has the ethical considerations followed in this study been stated. Kindly include a sub-section under the methods titled “Ethical considerations” and state the ethics of this study.</p>	<p>We are really grateful to the reviewer for his/her insightful suggestion for improving our manuscript. The term “maternal period” was specifically defined as per the reviewer’s suggestion. We corrected all the grammatical errors and tried to reshape the sentences as per reviewer suggestion. The full abbreviation of “MMR” was included in the manuscript.</p> <p>The sampling procedure was stated in a more defined way to avoid the confusion.</p> <p>The study was conducted on the basis of primary data. Due to some limitations of time and cost, it was not possible to collect data from the total population. But we tried our best to collect genuine responses from the recipients and the draw results which were more representative with the help of secondary data sources as well. Hope that this point justifies our perspectives regarding authenticity and representativeness.</p> <p>According to the reviewer’s comment, a sub-section under the methods titled “Ethical considerations” were included where the privacy of the answers given by the respondents were guaranteed. Hope that this addresses the concerns of the reviewer.</p> <p>We highlighted the correction in the revised paper.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 76: refer to my earlier comment about the use of maternal period in the abstract. When does the maternal period begin and end?</p> <p>Line 128: 41.99% cannot be referred to as “Majority”. It is not even half of the subgroup.</p> <p>Line 131: refer to my comment on the use of majority.</p> <p>Line 154-157: That is a strong conclusion without any reference. Provide appropriate references to support your claim.</p>	<p>As earlier said, the term “maternal period” was specifically defined as per the reviewer’s suggestion.</p> <p>The “Majority” referred portions were rephrased with appropriate adjectives. Reference was included according to the reviewer’s suggestion.</p> <p>We highlighted the correction in the revised paper.</p>
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be proofread by a native English speaker to correct grammar	All the grammatical errors were rechecked.

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>	