



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_50118
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Women Participation in Small-Scale Dairy Farming in Bangladesh: A Case of Paikgachha upazila, Khulna, 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>This manuscript deals with a very important issue, especially in rural areas, i.e. the women participation into the common farming activities. It includes very interesting data, but it needs to be more clear in how some of them were measured, and it lacks a proper discussion where the extent and implications of these results should be addressed.</p> <p>The introduction section needs more references. Authors should explain a little more how rural women participation is linked to reducing poverty, and to provide some light over other studies dealing with these questions.</p> <p>The Material & Methods section should start with a brief description of the study area, in order to let readers to understand the social, environmental and political context of this area. Furthermore, the 13 characteristics showed in table 1 of rural women are not even mentioned in this section. For example, how knowledge, cosmopolitaness, extension contact, poverty reduction and training were calculated? And some information about why these data may be important and how they are related to women participation, according to literature, would be nice to be included in the Introduction section.</p> <p>Results and Discussion. First of all, there is no need to repeat all the results gathered in table 1 in the text, only the most important that will let you to discuss. Secondly, there is no actual discussion of results, only a couple of researchs are mentioned in the first paragraph, but nothing more. You need to try to understand why these results are important and which are their implications, and how they are interacting amongst them and influencing one to another, supported by literature and othere researchers' results. Actually, in this first paragraph there are some comments that are not consistent with the data. For example: "Elderly farmers seem to be somewhat less motivated to adopt new dairy farm practices than younger ones". You are not exploring the adoption of new techniques by farmers, so these kind of comments are out of place.</p> <p>I think data from table 5 are the most important results, so I recommend you to focus the discussion on that.</p> <p>How was measured the "Extent of reducing poverty"? It is unclear. And the same question for data presented on figures 1 and 2.</p> <p>I think conclusion is not needed since it only represents a summary of the main results. Conclusion in a scientific paper should go beyond results and beyond discussion.</p>	<p>Methodology edited, information added Discussion added. Other issues also addressed and edited. Highlighted in the texts with yellow color.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	I declare that there is no ethical issues in this manuscript.