

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123861
Title of the Manuscript:	Competitiveness of Indian Rice in the Global Market: A Comprehensive RCA and NPC Evaluation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
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 is important especially for the Indian nation as it reveals that rice being one of the major export commodities should be given more attention so as to close the revenue gaps in the economy. The study also reveals the comparative advantage that the Indian nation have over other rice exporters and the need for a good economic policy which would enable the economy to utilize its comparative advantage effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine but the words: RCA AND NPC should be written in full before the acronym I suggest the topic goes this way: "Competitiveness of Indian Rice in the Global Market: A Comprehensive Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA) and Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPC) Evaluation"	
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 good. It captured all the required aspects.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sections and subsections are good BUT I will suggest that the numbering of the main sections should be differentiated from those of the sub-sections. For instance: The numbering should be as: 2. METHODOLOGY a. Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) b. Export Competitiveness OR you use the roman numerals to differentiate the numbering: 2. METHODOLOGY i. Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) ii. Export Competitiveness	
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.	This research is scientifically robust given that it explored different methodological approach relative to those of other related studies. i.e the Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA) and Nominal Protection Coefficient (NPC) that was employed for the analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are recent but not sufficient because more would emerge when the reviews of related literature are included in the article. There are so many related articles and I will suggest the author explore more to include the literature review section. Example of some related studies are: 1. A.V. Manjunatha; Lalith Achoth and N.C. Mamatha (2017): <i>The Future Rice Strategy for India: Chapter 14 - Export Competitiveness of Indian Rice</i> . ScienceDirect (2017), Pages 383-411. 2. S. Sangeeta Kumari; D. S. Perke and A. T. Kamble (2021): <i>Export Competitiveness and</i>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Price Trend of Basmati Rice. Economic Affairs. Vol. 66, No. 4. Pp. 665-669. DOI: 10.46852/0424-2513.4.2021.21</p> <p>Moreso, you'll have more references when you explore more related studies for the literature review section.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the quality of the English language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There is a missing section: THE LITERATURE REVIEW</p> <p>I suggest that you create a section: LITERATURE REVIEW before the methodology</p> <p>The literature will help you to explore other related studies which will also reveal the novelty of this research by showing how this particular study differs from other existing related studies. Hence, the knowledge gap to fill or the contribution to the body of knowledge.</p>	

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:	Millicent Adanne Eze
Department, University & Country	University of Abuja, Nigeria