

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript focuses on the evolution and growth of India's regional integration with the ASEAN. However, its overall and specific objectives are not indicated, hence it is difficult to gauge whether it has achieved them or not. In addition, the study methodology makes clear mention of its analysis tools as including Coefficient of Variation, Compound Growth Rate and Trade Intensity Index. However, the analysis does not discuss the underlying reasons for the observed trends in the Indicators, in terms of whether they are optimal or sub-optimal in relation to the policy targets of India or the ASEAN region or not, measures to be taken to reach the targets, if any, just to mention but a few.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not really. It could read: INDO-ASEAN TRADE RELATIONS: THE CASE OF INDIA'S AGRICULTURAL TRADE WITH THE ASEAN REGION.  Or it could also read like: DEEPENING INDO-ASEAN TRADE INTEGRATION: THE CASE OF INDIA'S AGRICULTURAL TRADE WITH THE ASEAN REGION.	
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 challenges with the abstract are the same as the main text itself, eg devoid of clarity on objectives and key lessons derived from the analysis.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are. Only that the section of study rationale/ objectives is missing.	
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 focus on indicators such as Coefficient of Variation, Compound Growth Rate and Trade Intensity Index is scientifically correct. However, the greater concern is exclusion of other popular trade analysis tools such as Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA), the Gravity Trade modelling using the Pseudo Poisson Maximum Likelihood (PPML), etc. It would also be of interest to explain the observed trade relation with some insights from consumer preference analysis results for Indian or ASEAN products as established from Constant Elasticity of Transformation (CET) analyses.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, currently they are. However, should the author decide to make the necessary changes, then definitely some more references will have to be added as well.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes, but there is always room for improvement.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NONE	

#### 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:	Frederick Bwayi Mng'ondi Msiska
Department, University & Country	Malawi