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	

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.	**This is an unexplored area and there is dearth of literature on the topic of market integration of domestic and international cotton prices. The scientific community can greatly benefit from the findings of the manuscript as it will give an idea about the causal relationship and interconnectedness between domestic and international markets. Findings can be used to prescribe policy suggestions.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**YES**	
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 fairly comprehensive, but addition of few points like data points, period and policy suggestions will make it clearer. Furthermore, inclusion of key words as per the JEL classification will increase the visibility of the article upon publication.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**YES**	
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 technically sound as it has employed a number of advanced econometric techniques, yet the robustness of the models have not been tested for serial correlation, homogeneity etc. Appropriate lag length for Johansen Co-integration test and VECM are not specified. Value of R^2 and Adj R^2 are too low for the model to be a good fit.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**More references may be added in the methodology and result section.**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The language quality of the article is good, but suitable checks for grammar and punctuations may be done.**	
Optional/General comments	1. The introduction is good but lacks motivation for the study and should be written in a more structured manner. 2. The component of review of literature seems to be missing and whatever is mentioned as part of the introduction does not appropriately contextualize the background of the study with reference to the existing studies. Research gap has not been traced. The strength of the paper quality can be increased based on the literature survey that can facilitate framing of the hypothesis. 3. The objective has been mentioned as a part of the introduction but it requires more clarity to be understood by the readers/research community. 4. The methodology seems to be good and has employed a number of advanced econometric techniques which is indeed the strength of the paper. However the section on methodology can be improved by providing the justifications for choice of the models corroborated by references from existing literature. Some specific points to be noted in this section are: a. The data sets chosen are not clear and there is no justification provided for the choice of the markets. b. Cotlook- A Index is not a market rather it is a barometer of price movement. c. The reference period of the data points and the number of data points is not mentioned clearly. d. The adoption of the exchange conversion rates lacks clarity. e. Co-integration test has been conducted without finding out the optimal lag length criterion. f. Need for justification of applying correlation techniques when autoregressive techniques were being employed. g. Structure of the methodology section may be enhanced. 5. The results are presented clearly in clean tables and graphs but interpretation of the findings is missing in the paper which would have increased the research value of the paper. 6. The conclusion nicely summarizes the essence of the study but specific recommendations for policy makers and future scope of research may be added to enhance the relevance of the paper.	

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)*	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Madhubrata Rayasingh**
Department, University & Country	**National Law University, India**