Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	It's an interesting paper, with comments: • 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	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Adriano Marcos Rodrigues Figueiredo**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, BraziL**