

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126717
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparative Study on Agricultural Production Efficiency in Jiangsu Province and Anhui Province: Based on a Three-stage DEA Model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses a critical area in agricultural efficiency, providing insight into how policy impacts local economies and agricultural production. The comparison between Jiangsu and Anhui adds depth, showing significant differences in efficiency due to resource availability, technological advances, and policy frameworks. The analysis is likely beneficial for policymakers in the Yangtze River region and can serve as a reference for similar comparative studies.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is clear, but a minor revision may enhance precision if desired. He can go with "Evaluating Agricultural Production Efficiency in Jiangsu and Anhui Provinces: A Three-Stage DEA and Malmquist Index Approach."	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but could briefly mention the key quantitative findings, such as Jiangsu's higher rate of technological progress and Anhui's potential in scale efficiency. Like Consider adding a brief statement on key findings in terms of quantitative results to make the abstract more informative.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The structure and subsections are well-organized	
<b>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.</b>	The methodology, which combines DEA and Malmquist models, is scientifically sound and offers an accurate efficiency analysis by accounting for external factors. The choice of environmental variables (such as urbanization rate and transportation accessibility) is well-justified and supports robust findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are relevant and recent, although the addition of studies on regional integration in agricultural efficiency contexts (if available) could broaden the scope.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	While generally clear, refining some sentences for conciseness and grammatical flow could enhance readability.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	For a clearer understanding, consider briefly summarizing each DEA stage (first, second, and third) in a sentence within the methods section, focusing on how each contributes to the overall efficiency measurement. The influence of specific environmental variables on efficiency is discussed, (but if possible try ) adding concrete examples (if available) for each variable's impact in Jiangsu and Anhui might make the findings more tangible. Based on this evaluation, a suggested rating might be 8-9 with a request for minor revisions. No ethical issues are noted within the manuscript	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>K S Druva Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ST Francis De Sales College (Autonomous), India</b>