

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_128881
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement of China's Agricultural New-Quality Productivity Forces and Analysis of Regional Differences
Type of the Article	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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper analyzes the innovations in new agricultural productivity in China and examines their impacts on sustainable agricultural development. By utilizing advanced analytical methods such as the entropy method and kernel density estimation, this study not only enhances our understanding of regional differences and challenges in agricultural productivity but also offers practical policy recommendations to improve this productivity. This research can aid in more precise policy-making and the strengthening of agricultural infrastructure in various regions, playing a significant role in economic and social development. Thus, the paper contributes to the theoretical enrichment of knowledge in this field and has significant practical and policy implications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article aptly reflects its content and includes key elements such as "new agricultural productivity" and "analysis of regional disparities." However, it could potentially be made more creative and engaging to capture greater attention while incorporating additional essential points. For instance, "Innovating China's Agriculture: Measuring New-Quality Productivity and Regional Disparities from 2012 to 2022" could be a more compelling alternative.	
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.	It is suggested that the abstract be presented concisely and comprehensively. Additionally, more details regarding the methods and key findings should be included. Clearly, providing more information about the methods and key findings can help readers better understand the significance of the research. Ultimately, using simpler language and shorter sentences will enhance clarity and simplicity in writing, potentially attracting more readers.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is generally scientifically sound, but for further improvement, a few points can be considered: more detailed explanations are needed in the methodology section and on data validation to ensure greater transparency. Charts and tables should be clear and readable, and the interpretation of results should be more comprehensive. The formatting of references should be carefully reviewed to comply with the required citation style. The results and implications should be presented concisely and effectively, with practical and applicable recommendations (for policymakers).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Regarding the currency of the references, it can be said that most of them are from 2020 onwards. The number of references also seems adequate. However, to enrich the manuscript and enhance its scientific value and credibility, additional references could always be considered. Furthermore, the references are well-aligned with the content of the manuscript, indicating that the title and subject matter are consistent with the cited works. It is recommended to review journals such as the "Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry" and "Agricultural Systems" (especially articles published after 2020) to further strengthen the credibility of the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used in this article is at an intermediate level and could be elevated to a higher standard (around 75 to 85) with minor improvements. While the content is scientific and precise, the complexity of some sentences and grammatical structures may hinder readability. Considering these aspects, I would rate the quality of English in the article at approximately 60 out of 100. Simplifying sentences, using more fluent language, and conducting a more thorough grammar review could help enhance the overall score.	
Optional/General comments	To further improve the article, several key aspects can be highlighted. Firstly, analyzing potential risks and challenges in agricultural productivity can add depth and comprehensiveness to the paper. Secondly, introducing practical examples or case studies from other countries or similar regions can help readers better understand the implementation of strategies and policies. Thirdly, a more thorough discussion on the social and economic impacts of agricultural productivity can enrich the article and present new perspectives. Fourthly, providing suggestions for future research can offer new ideas to other researchers in this field and illuminate future research paths. Finally, utilizing maps and visual charts instead of just tables and graphs can enhance the readability and appeal of the article, making the data easier for readers to understand.	

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:	Farid Rahimi
Department, University & Country	Roudehen Islamic Azad University, Iran