

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127653
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Efficiency and Value Added in Tofu Production: A Food Industry Perspective
Type of the Article	

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript scores valuable insights into optimizing efficiency and value-added processes within the tofu production industry, a critical component of food production in many regions. It highlights inefficiencies in resource allocation, offers detailed technical, allocative, and economic analyses, and proposes actionable recommendations to enhance productivity and sustainability. If the research was properly communicated, the findings may have practical implications for food industry stakeholders and policymakers seeking to improve the financial and operational viability of small- to medium-scale food processing enterprises	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is appropriate but could be more concise and focused. Suggested alternative: "Optimizing Efficiency and Value Addition in Tofu Production: An Industry Analysis" or "Optimizing Efficiency and Value Addition in Tofu Production: A Case Stud0079 of India Tofu Production Industry"	
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 abstract is detailed but overly technical, which may make it less accessible to a broader audience. Simplifying the language and providing a clearer summary of the objectives, methods, and implications would enhance its comprehensiveness. Suggestions: 1. Replace technical jargon with simpler terms (e.g., "economic efficiency less that I" should be clarified). 2. Include a brief mention of the practical applications of the findings for the industry.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and includes well-documented formulas, analyses, and methodologies. However, some sections, particularly the discussion of technical and allocative efficiency, could benefit from clearer explanations and connections to the research hypothesis	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate but could include more recent and relevant studies to strengthen the context, especially regarding advancements in food processing and sustainability practices. Suggestions: 1. Add references from journals published after 2020 to reflect the latest research trends. 2. Include studies on energy-efficient practices in food production to complement the analysis of solar energy inefficiencies.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality needs significant improvement for scholarly communication. Grammatical errors and awkward phrasing detract from the manuscript's readability. Professional proofreading or editing is recommended to refine syntax, structure, and word choice	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Gutman scale scoring method is described at length but could be summarized more effectively	

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:	Eyitayo Raji
Department, University & Country	University of Chicago Booth School of Business, United States