

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_84664
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis on the Import Quality of China's 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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>It's an interesting paper, with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It should be stated ln instead of capital letters LN• We need the proof that equation (1) can be estimated with (5).• There is a need for English revision from a native speaker• The variable ln cost shall be included in (5)• The instruments used in IV models were not declared• In Table 3, the P value in the bottom line is for which test?• Please, add quality of adjustment indicators like AIC or Residual sum of squares or other, so that we can judge the regressions• At the end of section 3, the results need more in-depth discussion• Don't you think that the quality sharply improved in 2002-2003 due to higher Chinese knowledge in world trade? Say, China got access to the “desired” or correct partners in terms of quality?• Do you believe that China could have accessed better products due to prices after the exchange rate? For example, Brazil was always sending their best due to the weak Real, while Australia was sending worse products to China because they sent their best to Europe?• In the conclusions, there is a suggestion for domestic products – they were analysed nor investigated in the paper – exclude or modify it	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capital letters LN in equation (1) have been replaced by ln• Subtract $\ln(1 - S_{0t})$ on both sides of the equation (1); add and simultaneously subtract $\sigma \ln(1 - S_{0t})$ on the right-hand side of equation (1). By using the property of logarithm, we can obtain equation (5). lnMarket will be replaced by lnpop or lnperGDP as proxy variables in later models• Some words and sentences have been revised highlighted in yellow• The variable Incost has been included in equation (5)• The instrumental variable has been analysed according to model 3.• The P values in Table 3 is used for Durbin-Wu Hausman test to identify the endogeneity.• Sum of Squares Regression (R^2) has been included• The coefficients of variables in Table 3 have been further analysed. The endogeneity has also been clearly declared• Higher Chinese knowledge in world trade can be partly accounted for the sharp quality improvement in 2002-2003. China has been actively participated in the world agricultural trade since WTO accession, especially with countries in South America. What's more, notifying Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures can also contribute to the higher quality of agricultural imports.• The suggestion for domestic products has been excluded.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	