

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJAEES_117923
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying the Factors of Export Competitiveness for Agricultural Products
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Overall, the contents of the manuscript contribute to the scientific community. However, it needs to be repaired again. Please revise your conclusion because there is still no conclusion to this article.</p> <p>2. Please correct the title of your article. It seems this is only specific to India.</p> <p>3. The abstract has been explained well</p> <p>4. The substructure of the writing has been explained well</p> <p>5. In general, perhaps this is a study for the Indian region. However, if it is used for other regions or countries it cannot be used yet.</p> <p>6. Reference improvements are needed. Please use references from the last 10 years. References that are too long will create data or studies that are less valid due to changes over time.</p>	<p>Dear Madam/sir, we truly appreciate your suggestion to improve the quality of the manuscript. According to your suggestions, all the changes made in the manuscript have been highlighted and marked in yellow colour.</p> <p>1. Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions and concerns on conclusion. Based on the study, we have now added the conclusion and highlighted in yellow colour.</p> <p>2. Thank you very much for your comments on the title. However, we would like to put the current manuscript entitled “Identifying the Factors of Export Competitiveness for Agricultural Products”. Because the identified factors can be used in any country's agri-product competitiveness analysis. Hence, the Authors are requesting to the editors and reviewers please accept the current title, which will cover the broader perspective and large audience on the agri-product's competitiveness analysis by the identified factors.</p> <p>3. Yes, this study is related to Indian agri-products competitiveness. However, the identified factors of study may be useful to any country's agri-products export competitiveness. So, this study can be useful as a benchmark for other countries and agri-products export competitiveness.</p> <p>4. Thank you for highlighting the issue in the references. We have included some recently published articles according to the reviewer's suggestion. However, based on the need of the study, some articles have been cited in the manuscript which has been published for more than 10 years.</p> <p>5. Here, we would like to put both figures in black and white.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please read the comments on the file</p>	<p>Thank you very much to the editorial committee and reviewers who spent their valuable time reviewing this article and suggesting their opinions to make it more enriched and impactful. We have tried our best to address all the comments raised by the reviewers. we have carefully addressed your suggestions and made the corresponding revisions in the revised version; we hope you will be satisfied with the revisions.</p>

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions and concerns regarding the revised version of the manuscript. Although there are some comments and suggestions on references and citations, they are welcome. Here, various statements and sentences have been written by the author's own understanding according to the need and support for the study. So, we could not cite the references in those places.