

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126139
Title of the Manuscript:	INDO-ASEAN TRADE RELATIONS: TRENDS IN AGRICULTURAL SECTOR OF INDIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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)
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.	This manuscript holds importance for the scientific community by delivering an in-depth analysis of Indo-ASEAN trade relations, with a particular focus on agricultural trade trends. It applies rigorous statistical methods to assess trade imbalances, providing meaningful insights for economic and agricultural policy development. The study is grounded in relevant data, making it a valuable resource for both policymakers and researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it clearly reflects the content of the manuscript	
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 thorough and clearly outlines the study's objectives, methods, and main findings. Nonetheless, it would be improved by placing greater emphasis on the importance of the findings for future trade policies. Including brief mentions of specific policy recommendations or strategies to mitigate trade deficits could enhance its impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well organized, effectively guiding the reader through the background, methodology, results, and conclusions in a clear and coherent manner.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, utilizing well-established statistical techniques, including the Compound Growth Rate and Trade Intensity Index, to assess trade trends. It draws on credible data sources, such as the UN Comtrade database, which ensures precision and relevance. Furthermore, the discussion is firmly anchored in existing literature, strengthening the reliability of the findings and offering a strong basis for policy recommendations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and contain numerous recent and pertinent sources. While additional references are not required, incorporating more studies from the past five years could enhance the manuscript's current relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and well-structured, though some minor edits could further enhance readability.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Adebayo Moses Oluwadamilare
Department, University & Country	Miami University, USA