

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127009
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Competitiveness Edge: Afghanistan's Fresh Grapes Export Performance in the Global Market
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Research on horticulture is important because it can address global challenges related to food security and nutrition. Grapes are important horticulture crops of Afghanistan and the country is one of the leading producers globally. I particularly like the manuscript because it exposes the fresh grapes production scenario in Afghanistan and the reason behind persistent growth of the crop production and export.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript lacks clarity and focus on research content of the study. My recommendation is: "Assessing the Global Export Competitiveness of Fresh Grapes in Afghanistan"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The information in the abstract is scattered. The flow of information is missing in the abstract. The research problem is not addressed well and the methodology of the research is not discussed in here. While reading the abstract it looks more like a review paper than a research paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure needs revision. The flow of information is missing.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I would summarise the corrections in three points: 1. References: The introduction part lacks reference. The first paragraph itself is referenced as anonymous. Most of the reference are missing in the reference list. 2. Clarity: the flow of idea is nor addressed well in the manuscript. 3. Research Problem: the research problem should be written with clarity in the last paragraph of the Intro.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references are not sufficient. Most of them are missing. For Example: "National Research Centre for grape, ICAR, India 2017" the reference is missing in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are many grammatical mistakes found in the manuscript. The author has used AI language most of the time.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript may be accepted after a revision.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tahera Arjumand
Department, University & Country	College of Forestry, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, India