

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_96722
Title of the Manuscript:	A Quantification of Virtual Water Trade of Major Agricultural Commodities 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript has a potential for publishing as it examines a pending issue for agriculture in India. It can provide knowledge to policy makers and academia on optimal trading decisions. However, it stills lacks robustness and detail. 2. The title is not very attractive and should focus more on the Heckscher- Ohlin Model and the VWT. 3. The abstract is sound and explanatory. 4. The structure of the paper is formidable and according to the Journal's guidelines. 5. There is no reference on Virtual Water Imports and only Exports are examined. Need to incorporate this aspect in the Methodology too. Discussion on the comparative advantage focuses only on Rice and Groundnut and trade relations with China. Maybe the scope of the paper should shift to India-China agri-trade. 6. References are outdated and insufficient. The theoretical background is very poor, and little is reported on previous studies. Please have a look at this paper below for the overall concept and structure this manuscript is trying to achieve: https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/5/2978 7. The manuscript will require heavy revision to be reconsidered for publication	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality needs improvement	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexandros Gkatsikos
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece