



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_61456
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Perception and Consumption of Organic Foods in Dhaka City, 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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>ABSTRACT</p> <p>The abstract is not well-written.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>The purpose, research question(s) and assumption(s) of the study are not explicitly stated in the Introduction.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>There are some vague statements in the methodology.</p> <p>How was the survey instrument administered to the respondents? How was random sampling done?</p> <p>How many questions were there all-in-all? How many of these are open-ended? What were the open-ended questions all about?</p> <p>How did you choose your survey areas?</p> <p>Why did you settle for the age brackets used under the socio-economic profiling? What is the logical explanation for that?</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>The paper's originality is low. There is nothing novel or unique on the findings. The findings are no different from many articles with similar research focus and objectives. Socio-economic factors and responses to the different parameters of the respondents from the four survey areas in Dhaka City should have been compared with each other to make this study different from the recently published paper with the same topic, parameters, and place of study as this. In so doing, your paper would become more interesting and relevant.</p> <p>Research findings were not systematically organized and not thoroughly discussed. This paper failed to fully represent what a descriptive research should be. The relationships between and among variables should have been closely looked into.</p> <p>Data analyses showing the strength(s) and/or weakness(es) of the relationships between/among variables are inadequate. Statistical tools such as univariate analysis, chi-square test, ANOVA, and correlation analysis should have been used (whichever is applicable).</p> <p>There are findings discussed which were not covered by the objective. Case in Point (CIP): Consumer satisfaction level on the availability and price of organic food in the local market.</p> <p>Tables and figures are not properly labeled and confusing.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The conclusions and findings are not well-aligned.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	REFERENCES Some of the references cited are quite outdated. The research should have only used literature that were published for the last 5-10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Amelia R. Nicolas
Department, University & Country	Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA), Philippines