

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122414
Title of the Manuscript:	Export Competitiveness of Indian Coffee: Analysing Trade Potential in the Global Market
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 based on '**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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. authors must 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.	This study which investigates the export competitiveness of Indian coffee in the global market is worth it because it highlights that coffee exportation is one of the main sources of government revenue. it's a source of job creation from its plantation to exportation. Therefore, the government needs to focus on the improvement of the sector for development and resource mobilization for social development	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 comprehensive but should indicate the sources of data	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 article raises the question of the competitiveness of coffee exports to India, a strategic raw material for the country. From planting to production to marketing, the coffee sector is a major employer. A critical look at this sector can help the government to develop it more effectively.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author could update the estimation techniques by using the PPMLDFE and justify: the article of reference (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1536867X20909691)	

Review Form 3

=		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author should get Grammarly to consider the misspellings; errors and wrong formulation of sentences. To sum up, the article is well-written and the article is suitable for the scholarly.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>1. Before the last paragraph (The purpose of this study was to analyse How does this study differ from the others? The author should include it before the indicated paragraph (last paragraph of the introduction)</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>1. How did the authors get the 178 trading partners?</p> <p>2. Table 6: the author should write the full name of the variables to ease the reading</p> <p>3. Reference 1 there is a need to capitalise the proper nouns "Coffee Berry Borer"</p> <p>4. The author should be able to justify why the dataset ranges from 2014-2023. Does that mean that India was not exporting coffee before 2014?</p> <p>5. All the table's sources are supposed to have data length (from 2021.....20....) EX: Table 5..... Source: Authors' computations, sources of data, from Year A.....Year Z</p> <p>6. The author could update the estimation techniques by using the PPMLDFE and justify: the article of reference (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1536867X20909691)</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:	Kouadio N'guessan Michael
Department, University & Country	University Institute of Governance, Humanities and Social Sciences of Yaoundé, Cote d'Ivoire