

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123001
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy Analysis of NCDEX Spot and Futures Trading in Spices
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 left out important details. Prominent amongst the details left out is the failure to identify the motivation or the problem this study intends to address. The topic is not clearly stated and misaligns with what seemed to be the objective of this paper. The hypothesis should be stated to guide the researcher while also situating the work within existing knowledge and anchoring the work on an appropriate theoretical foundation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not suitable. Effect of Spot and Futures Prices on the Performance of NCDEX Trading in Spices	
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.	State the method of data analysis/variables of the study. Report the main results in line with the objectives of the study. Make policy recommendations	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are not appropriate. No section for literature review. No section for discussion of result.	
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 not robust for lacking in scientific presentation and depth. No problem identified and technique for analysis were misplaced and not appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are not sufficient explaining the lack of depth in the study. The authors should do a literature search. They did not complain about dearth of literature in this area of study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This needs to be improved on significantly.	
Optional/General comments		

Comment [u1]: One starts to wonder the meaning of this from the title. The title should be simple, direct and clear.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benedict Ikemefuna Uzoechina
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria