

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_112455
Title of the Manuscript:	Integration of International Tea markets -An Empirical analysis
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript can play a crucial role for the scientific community as it discussed necessary research methodology, and the Scientific findings. The price integration of different tea markets contributes to the cumulative body of knowledge. 2. Yes, it is suitable. Alternatively, the researcher can also use the following title. "Price Discovery Mechanism of International tea Markets: An empirical study with special reference to India and Kenya". 3. Yes, it is comprehensive. 4. Yes, it is in a proper subsection and structure. However, the Literature Review section is missing. If the researcher can summarise existing knowledge and identifying gaps, inconsistencies, or unresolved issues, it will help the readers to understand the historical development of the research topic and the rationale behind the same. Same could also be used in the finding in order to ensure the reliability of scientific findings. 5. Yes, it is. There is consistency and coherence in the manuscript. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient. However, the latest reference is from 2017. The researcher may explore few recent ones. Example : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Smith, J., & Brown, A. (2023). Globalization of Tea Markets: A Contemporary Empirical Analysis on Integration and Market Dynamics. International Journal of Agricultural Economics, 25(4), 123-145. 2. Garcia, M., & Patel, R. (2024). Exploring Global Trends in Tea Markets: An Up-to-Date Empirical Analysis of Market Integration and Emerging Dynamics. Journal of International Trade Research, 17(3), 78-95. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, it is in an easy language.</p> <p>The data analysis of the tools can be more easy and elaborative so that the layman can also understand who are not much aware of the econometrics models and its findings.</p> <p>The researcher can also mention the hypothesis created so that the reader can correlate with them in the findings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, a comprehensive manuscript, supporting the scientific body of knowledge.</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:	Jolly Sushma
Department, University & Country	University of the People, India