

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
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>

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>
<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>	The manuscript provides valuable insights into the quality trends of Chinese agricultural exports to Japan, a topic of significant relevance given the dynamic trade environment and stringent quality standards imposed by Japan. By employing the nested logit method and analyzing HS 9-digit code data from 2001 to 2017, the study offers a comprehensive understanding of how export quality impacts trade competitiveness. This work is crucial for policymakers and trade analysts aiming to enhance the quality and competitiveness of agricultural exports	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.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title accurately reflects the core subject of the manuscript. However, a slight modification to emphasize the analytical framework could enhance clarity. Suggested title: "Assessing the Quality of Chinese Agricultural Products Exported to Japan: Insights from Nested Logit Analysis."	We thank you for the very helpful comments. We have revised the title to " <a href="#">Evaluating the Quality of Chinese Agricultural Products Exported to Japan: Insights from Nested Logit Analysis</a> ".
<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 is detailed and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. To improve focus, consider highlighting specific results such as the proportion of products in the low-quality bracket and the significance of the nested logit model. Avoid redundancy in discussing the fluctuating trends.	We have taken your suggestions seriously in our revised manuscript and have improved the abstract to enhance its clarity and structure. In particular, the conclusions of the study have been rewritten ( <a href="#">see red markers in the abstract</a> ).
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound. It employs a robust methodology, leveraging a nested logit model and comprehensive datasets. The use of instrumental variables to address endogeneity enhances the validity of findings. The conclusions align with the presented evidence.	We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and recent, covering foundational theories and recent empirical studies. However, adding references related to advancements in agricultural export quality improvements post-2017 could further contextualize the findings.	We sincerely appreciate the valuable comment. We have added some recent references into the Introduction part in the revised manuscript. <a href="#">[1] Zhou L, Luo J, Fang P. Who will feed China in the 21st century? Pandemic Crisis, Glocalization and Organized Responsibility.</a>

Review Form 3

		<p>International Economic Review. 2021;(05):53-80+6.</p> <p>[2] Yu M, Cai H. Does Free Trade Agreement Alleviate the Quality Upgrading Dilemma of China's Agricultural Exports. International Trade Issues. 2022;(08):136-155. DOI:10.13510/j.cnki.jit.2022.08.001.</p> <p>[13] Long Y. Export competitiveness of agricultural products and agricultural sustainability in China. Regional Sustainability. 2021 Jul 1;2(3):203-10.</p>
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical and syntactical errors are present, such as incomplete sentences in the introduction and overly long paragraphs. These can be addressed during final proofreading.	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	<p>The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed discussion on the policy implications of its findings.</p> <p>No ethical issues are identified in this manuscript.</p> <p>None observed.</p> <p>No evidence of plagiarism was found in the manuscript. The content appears original and well-researched.</p>	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 (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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	