

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_91157
Title of the Manuscript:	Trade Competitiveness of Jute in India
Type of the 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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should follow the journal's formal Should not be more than 250 words. It 316 words. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should present the problem of the jute <p>Literature</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study could be improved if there are more support literature. <p>Method</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It was not clear what method was used in the study. It should indicate that the method used is content analysis because the source of data was secondary data. It this study is content analysis, a theoretical lens should be provided as basis of the analysis of data. <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not all cited authors in the paper is not found in the reference list. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Should be written in present tense. Should answer the question "What now?" after arriving at the results. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ariel E San Jose
Department, University & Country	Aquatic School of Technology, Philippines