

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120362</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the Impact of Agricultural Subsidies on Farm Profitability and Sustainability</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I like this manuscript due to the important conclusion it aims to achieve regarding the sustainability and long-term viability of subsidies in the agricultural sector. In my opinion, this manuscript presents a high importance for the scientific community due to the fact that understanding the long-term effects of subsidies and other alternatives to subsidies for agriculture will help scientists, policymakers and stakeholders to formulate better assistance programs that can have a positive impact in the long term for the producers, for consumers, as well as for the environment. The conclusion that this manuscript comes to is interesting and well-thought out, with a good amount of second-hand scientific data that helps back it up.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>I find the abstract of the article to be comprehensive. I consider it to be good as it is.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and technically sound due to the fact that it encapsulates scientific data from various well-known institutions with a well-kept track record of accuracy. The manuscript does not appear to have biased implications from the side of the authors and provides a conclusion based on the data presented and case examples provided. Due to the aforementioned reasons provided, this manuscript appears scientifically robust.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Minor additions, the Figure number 4 is described as a table of data about subsidies but seems to display data regarding the value of agricultural exports instead. For subsection 4.2, the subtitle is not separated from the following text. For Figure number 5, the title of the image does not correspond with the description title.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Monica Ocnean</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I", Romania</b>