

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_129927
Title of the Manuscript:	Changing structure of Food Manufacturing Industry of Haryana: A comparative analysis
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript examines the structure, growth, and linkages of Haryana's food manufacturing industry, filling a notable research gap in regional industrial studies. This work analyzes subsectors using long-term ASI data (2008–2022) and NIC classifications, and provides critical insights into the industry's contributions to Haryana's economy, its imbalances, and its forward and backward linkages. This work is valuable for academics, policymakers, and industry stakeholders interested in agro-processing, regional industrial growth, and economic linkages.	Agree
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Title of manuscript is appropriate and concise enough, gives a hint to the readers as to what the content is all about.	Agree
<b>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.</b>	The abstract clearly outlines the study's objectives, highlighting dominant subsectors (e.g., grain milling) and the industry's inconsistent growth trends. But it lacks specific mentions of the methodology (NIC codes and ASI data) and the research gap. Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a line about the methodology: "The study uses ASI data (2008–2022) and NIC classifications to evaluate subsector performance."</li> <li>• Emphasize implications for policy, e.g., "The findings highlight the need for subsector diversification and investment in infrastructure."</li> </ul>	Agree
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The study uses solid quantitative methods, such as Annual Growth Rate (AGR) and Average Annual Growth Rate (AAGR), to evaluate trends (e.g., meat processing showed the highest AAGR of 44.04%, Table 3). Tables and data provide a detailed breakdown of subsector performance and highlight imbalances (e.g., no fish processing units, Table 2). But in some places it does get a bit random. The absence of fish processing units is mentioned but not explained. The analysis of technological advancements based on high working capital intensity lacks specific examples or case studies. Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide possible reasons for the absence of fish processing units, such as geographical or logistical challenges.</li> <li>• Add examples of technological advancements linked to high working capital intensity (e.g., automation or new storage systems).</li> </ul>	Agree
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The manuscript draws on relevant data sources like the Annual Survey of Industries and government reports. Although some references are outdated, but it's not the issue. But incomplete citations do exist, like "(n.d.) Retrieved from Investor Portal..." lacks access dates. Ensure that all citations are complete and correctly formatted.	Agree

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is generally clear and well-structured. Although There are instances of awkward phrasing and verbosity. For example:</p> <p>"Meat processing units are crawling in terms of numbers only to get a considerable share" (Abstract) is unclear. It can be rephrased as: "Meat processing units remain few, limiting their contribution to the sector."</p> <p>"Working capital intensity has been showing much fluctuating trend" can be simplified to: "Working capital intensity has fluctuated significantly."</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise awkward phrases for clarity and conciseness.</li> <li>• Conduct a professional language edit to ensure readability.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree</p>
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript identifies subsector imbalances (e.g., dominance of grain milling, low growth in dairy and fruit processing) and fluctuations in output and investment (Table 5).</li> <li>• The use of raw material and working capital intensity (Table 6) effectively highlights forward and backward linkages.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy implications are underdeveloped. For example, what steps can Haryana take to improve underperforming subsectors like dairy and fruit processing?</li> <li>• The fluctuating performance of the food processing industry (e.g., negative growth in multiple years, Table 4) is mentioned but not explained in depth.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include policy suggestions, such as incentives for subsectoral growth, cold storage facilities, and infrastructure improvement.</li> <li>• Discuss potential causes for fluctuating performance, such as economic downturns or supply chain inefficiencies.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree</p>

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	