

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_130567
Title of the Manuscript:	The Quality of Chinese Agricultural Products Exported to Japan
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 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>

Review Form 3

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.	The quality of Chinese agricultural product exports to Japan is of significant importance as it directly impacts trade relations, consumer trust and economic growth between the two countries; ensuring high standards enhances market competitiveness, meets Japan's stringent regulatory requirements, and fosters a positive perception of Chinese produce, ultimately contributing to the stability and expansion of agricultural trade in the region	We value the constructive comments of the reviewer and thank you for your time and effort in doing so. Based on your constructive comments and suggestions, we have revised the paper.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF CHINESE AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO JAPAN: TRENDS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES.	We thank you for the very helpful comments.  We have revised the title to "Evaluating the Quality of Chinese Agricultural Products Exported to Japan: Insights from Nested Logit Analysis".
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 stated that the study used “nested legit method” please add up the population, sample size and sampling techniques, method of data collection and analysis.	We have taken your suggestions seriously in the revised manuscript. We have improved the abstract to indicate in detail issues such as analytical methods and sample selection.  "This study examined the spatial and temporal evolution of the quality level of China's agricultural exports to Japan based on HS 9-digit coded data on Japan's imports of agricultural products from 158 countries around the world from 2001 to 2017, using the Nested Logit Method."
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not really, the use of futuristic terms, the article needs to be revisited by editing the sentence in past terms since the article is completed	Thanks for your careful checks. We are sorry for our carelessness. We have tried our best to polish the language in the revised manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in the revised paper. We hope that the correction will meet with approval.
Optional/General comments	From the introduction_ the first to fifth paragraphs are highly opinionated, first paragraph, all the figures in the paragraph, where did you get it, please put the source, if not it is plagiarised. Modelling and Data- the study made used of futuristic terms, still assuming or proposing- revisit and change all those, will gain, this paper will use. Conclusion- reads like summary of the work, revisit	1.We apologize for our carelessness. All digital sources have been labeled in footnotes in our resubmitted manuscript (see footnotes 1 and 2 of page 2 in the revised manuscript). Thank you for the reminder.  2.We sincerely thank you for your careful reading. Based on the suggestions, we have done our best to correct the inappropriate tenses and incorrect expressions in the article.  3.We have rewritten the conclusion section according to your suggestion, emphasizing the impacts resulting from the lower quality of China's agricultural exports. We further discusses the practical reasons for its emergence in the light of China's national context and feasible policy recommendations based on our findings (See the second and third paragraphs of Section 4 on pages 26-27 in the revised manuscript).

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>	