Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_125881**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MARKET INTEGRATION OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL COTTON PRICES**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of both domestic Indian markets and international markets, offering insights into price transmission mechanisms across different spatial markets. The study's methodological approach is commendable, employing a robust combination of analytical tools including Augmented Dickey-Fuller and Phillips-Perron Tests, Johansen's cointegration, Granger causality, and Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) which strengthens the reliability of the findings and provides a more complete picture of market integration dynamics. The time period covered in the study (January 2010 to February 2024) is particularly valuable as it encompasses several significant events in the global cotton market, including price spikes and market reforms, making the findings highly relevant for understanding long-term market dynamics and integration patterns.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**The title of the manuscript is broad and generic, lacking specificity about geographical focus.** **I will suggest "Market Integration of India Domestic and International cotton market prices"**	
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 moderately comprehensive but could be enhanced.** **The abstract should include the frequency of the data (e.g, Monthly) and time period of the study which is crucial information for context.** **Keywords should also be included**.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**NO.** **DATA section should be given a proper heading like "MATERIALS AND METHODS" and should be well detailed to include Study Area, Method of data collection and Analysis.** **Results section should have a clear heading "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION".** **"POLICY IMPLICATION" should come before "CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION"**	
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 through its comprehensive methodological approach, employing multiple validated statistical techniques to analyze market integration. Proper testing of data for stationarity before applying cointegration analysis, and the use of both trace statistics and maximum eigenvalue tests in the Johansen's procedure to confirm the number of cointegrating vectors, which aligns with established econometric practices. The research design is particularly robust as it uses a systematic progression of analyses; starting with basic correlation analysis, moving through stationarity tests (both ADF and Phillips-Perron), and culminating in sophisticated econometric tools like Johansen's cointegration test, Granger causality, and Vector Error Correction Model (VECM). The reliability of the findings is enhanced by the use of a substantial dataset spanning from January 2010 to February 2024, which provides adequate temporal coverage for analyzing long-term market relationships.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **:**	**The references are recent but not sufficient. The manuscript would benefit from additional literatures review in three key areas:** • **Recent global cotton market integration studies** • **Updated policy papers on international cotton trade** • **Contemporary regional market analysis studies, particularly from Asian markets** **Every information provided in the introduction section should be properly referenced. For example, there are no references for the following statements** **i. "Major cotton producing countries during 2020-21 were, China (37.73 million bales) followed by India (35.30 million bales), USA (18.69 million bales), Brazil (13.85 million bales) and Pakistan (5.76 million bales). The total world cotton production in 2020-21 stood at 142.78 million bales but the global consumption was 155.84 million bales. The**	

	growing demand from global textile mills, apparel manufacturing market, fashion industry and other markets has over taken the production". **ii. "During the year 2020-21, India produced 353.4 lakh bales of cotton. The major share in production was held by Maharashtra with 101.05 lakh bales in 44.91 lakh hectares followed by Gujarat (72.18 lakh bales), Telangana (57.97 lakh bales), Rajasthan (32.07 lakh bales) and Karnataka (23.20 lakh bales)".** **iii. "Despite being the major producer, the productivity is below world average productivity. Cotton cultivation in India is affected by pest and disease infestation, harsh weather and poor soil conditions etc. which influences the market supply and prices".**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The content is academically sound, the language quality needs improvement to meet the standards typically expected in scholarly communications. The issues are not severe enough to obscure meaning, but addressing them would enhance the paper's professionalism and readability.** **However, there are needs for improvement in the following areas:** • **Some sentence constructions, e.g., "The unit root test using an autoregressive model was employed to examine whether a time series variable is non-stationary", "The current study on cointegration analysis was taken up to analyse..." could be more concise** • **Inconsistent hyphenation (e.g., "co-integration" and "cointegration")**	
Optional/General comments	**Generally, the manuscript presents valuable research with sound methodology and important findings that will contribute to knowledge and it is valuable for India cotton market development. However, the literature review should be more comprehensive and justification should be made for markets selection.** **Results discussion should be well formatted and cross-reference where necessary.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Iliasu, Kamaldeen Biodun**
Department, University & Country	**National Horticultural Research Institute, Nigeria**