

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122584
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Impact of ICDP on Coffee Production, Yield, and Exports in India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<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 manuscript is likeable to me, because it gives a comprehensive evaluation of ICDP, a significant agricultural policy intervention in India It employs a rigorous statistical method; Interrupted Time Series Analysis (ITSA) The study contributes valuable insights into the dynamics of coffee production, yield, and exports, which are critical for both economic policy and agricultural research.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is clear and accurately reflects the content of the study. It effectively communicates the focus on assessing the Integrated Coffee Development Project (ICDP) and its influence on key aspects of India's coffee sector.</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>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key aspects of the study, including the context, methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, there are a few areas that can be improved to make it better:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>While the abstract mentions "traditional and non-traditional growing regions," it does not specify which regions in India are being referred to at this level. Including this information can improve it. They are however clearly defined later in the manuscript, but a good abstract needs to allow a straight-ward insight to the readers, nonetheless.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>In my opinion, yes. The structure of the manuscript appears logical and organized, with clearly defined sections.</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>This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous application of well-established statistical methods, such as ITSA, which is appropriate for evaluating the impact of policy interventions over time. The use of multiple analytical approaches, including growth rate analysis and trade competitiveness metrics, adds robustness to the findings by providing a comprehensive evaluation from different perspectives. The data sources, such as those from the Coffee Board of India and the International Coffee Organization, are credible and relevant, further ensuring the reliability of the results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references are not sufficient to help fully backup the discussion of results, and consider adding recent literature as well i.e., VA, N. A., & Panakaje, N. (2023). A Review of the Factors Impacting Coffee Cultivators (Growers) and the use of Plantation Agriculture Schemes. International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT and Education (IJCSBE), 7(1), 107-140. Namreen Asif V. A., Niyaz Panakaje, Growth of Coffee Cultivation, Consumption & Production in India – An Overview, International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT and Education (IJCSBE): Vol. 6 No. 2 (2022): Volume 6 Issue 2.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is sufficient.	
Optional/General 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:	John Chrysostom Opedun
Department, University & Country	BOKU University, Austria