

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_110682
Title of the Manuscript:	Econometric Modelling and Forecasting of Tea Production and productivity
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>To my mind, the answer is yes. The scientific community ideally focuses on researches leading to inventions, innovations and creativity which promote the safety and happiness (food security) of mankind. According to Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), 2022, "global consumption of tea increased annually by 3.5% over the last decade". This single report validates the importance of the manuscript to the scientific community.</p> <p>I do think that the title will be suitable if it reads "Econometric Modeling for High Impact Sustainable Organic Tea Production". This title applies to this era of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).</p> <p>In this case, it is not comprehensive. The abstract only deals with econometric modeling for post-harvest tea production. No doubt, productivity reflects the outlooks of both the pre-harvest and post-harvest segments.</p> <p>Not appropriate. The subsections under the Literature Review should have included various components of tea production that guarantee high productivity. The structure is equally narrow in scope.</p> <p>In view of its established context, the manuscript is correct. It is an investigation for the tea production and yield in India using the Box-Jenkins method.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient as it does not contain global outlook such as Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. A reference that is recent is like FAO/EST, 2022.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of material fact is great, but the language quality is not suitable for academic presentation. In fact, the first paragraph under Introduction lacks grammatical coherence. For example, the third and fourth sentences read as "At the present time tea is the most popular drink in the all over world and its refreshes the mind and gives energy. In recent time without a cup of tea, a common man cannot be think of starting the day". Such language will not produce an enjoyable reading.</p> <p>It will be scholarly suitable if it should read "At the present time, tea is the most popular drink all over world and it refreshes and gives energy to the mind. Consequently, a common man cannot be said to start his day without a cup of tea".</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prince David N. Gbarato
Department, University & Country	Bori Business School, Nigeria