

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126191
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Capital Utilization Efficiency in Agricultural Listed Firms Based on a Three-Stage Data Envelopment Analysis
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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 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.</p>	<p>The contribution of this paper is light and would need to be expanded and a theoretical foundation provided. In addition, the analysis lacks in-depth analysis and discussion of empirical results.</p> <p>-Some most recent/relevant papers are not discussed.</p> <p>https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-023-29718-9</p> <p>https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9717/8/9/1064</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2022.1004.0310</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-25412-y</p> <p>-Mechanisms should be provided to help readers understand the story of the paper.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>a) Please add the motivation statement in the abstract. The paper's abstract must be improved according to why, how, and for whom this study was conducted.</p> <p>b) Authors have to justify the importance of the article in context to their proposed title that why it is necessary. In the last paragraph of the introduction authors have to revise the major objectives of the study. Motivation and novelty of the paper should be revised.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Authors should summarize all the key findings of the research in the abstract.</p> <p>2. The main contribution of the study should be highlighted more clearly.</p> <p>3. Author should need to cite recent literature and highlight the research gap add like https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-25412-y, https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211032173, https://doi.org/10.3390/pr8091064, https://doi.org/10.35784/pe.2022.1.04,</p> <p>4. The research methods used are appropriate but have limitations, and this should be mentioned.</p> <p>5. The discussion and implications are rather short, and they should be extended. It would be appropriate to specify in more detail how this research differs from the already published paper that deals with a similar topic.</p> <p>6. To increase the significance of the results, the discussion part should embrace the differences and similarities among your findings and those of other scholars.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>-More work is needed to establish the robustness of the results.</p> <p>-The policy implications section is quite weak.</p> <p>-The writing needs improvement.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	To increase the significance of the results, the discussion part should embrace the differences and similarities among your findings and those of other scholars.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	You need also to improve the practical and academic implications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Conclusions should be expanded, pointing to the limitations of the analyzed problem and defining the directions of further research	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maryam Khokhar
Department, University & Country	School of Economics and Management, Tongji University, China