

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>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This manuscript addresses a critical area in international trade and agricultural economics by exploring the quality of Chinese agricultural exports to Japan. The study's emphasis on the Nested Logit Model and empirical evidence enriches existing literature. The findings can guide policymakers and exporters in improving product quality and competitiveness.</li><li>The paper provides insights into the dynamics of trade barriers, quality regulations, and market competitiveness, which are valuable for scholars and practitioners.</li><li>The study is timely and relevant given the increasing focus on food safety and quality standards in global trade.</li></ul>	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)	Yes, the title accurately reflects the manuscript's content. However, it could be refined to "Evaluating the Quality of Chinese Agricultural Exports to Japan: Trends and Policy Implications" for more clarity and academic appeal.	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> ".

Review Form 3

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 could be improved by highlighting the policy recommendations explicitly. Including a sentence about the significance of the findings for stakeholders would enhance its impact.	We have added the policy recommendations to the last sentence of the abstract.  "To this end, China should vigorously improve the pesticide regulatory policy, implement standardized production, and establish production advantage zones for special agricultural products."
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically robust. The use of the Nested Logit Model and extensive data analysis is appropriate for the research objectives.</li><li>The methodology is well-defined, and the conclusions are logically derived from the results. However, the manuscript should clarify the limitations of the study.</li></ul>	Thanks for the suggestion.  We have elucidated about the limitations of the research methodology, mainly in the endogeneity problem that can result from Nested Logit Models (See lines 5-8 of page 7 in the revised manuscript). And this endogeneity problem is mitigated by the instrumental variable approach in the model (See lines 4-6, 9-11 of page 10 in the revised manuscript).  In addition, due to space constraints, we apologize for not being able to discuss other limitations further.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant. Most sources are recent and address key areas of trade and product quality. Including additional references on global food safety standards and their evolution could strengthen the discussion.	We sincerely appreciate the valuable comment. We have added references on agricultural access standards into the Introduction part in the revised manuscript.  [1] Zhou L, Luo J, Fang P. Who will feed China in the 21st century? Pandemic Crisis, Glocalization and Organized Responsibility. International Economic Review. 2021;(05):53-80+6.  [26] Dong YG, Huang JW. Impact of SPS measures on quality upgrading of agricultural exports: An empirical analysis based on Proximity to Frontier Model. Journal of International Trade. 2018;10:45-57. DOI: 10.13510/j.cnki.jit.2018.10.004.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally good but requires minor improvements for clarity and grammatical accuracy. For example, some sentences in the "Introduction" and "Conclusions" sections could be more concise.	Thanks for your suggestion. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the policy implications of the findings. For example, how can China's agricultural sector address pesticide residue challenges to meet Japan's Positive List System requirements?</li><li>Including visual aids, such as flowcharts or tables summarizing the key policy recommendations, would enhance reader engagement.</li></ul> No ethical issues were identified. The manuscript uses secondary data sources, and there is no indication of ethical concerns.	We have rewritten the conclusion section according to your suggestion. We further discuss the existence and causes of excessive pesticide residue in China's agricultural sector (See the second paragraph of Section 4 on pages 26-27 in the revised manuscript) and feasible policy recommendations (See the third paragraph of Section 4 on pages 27 in the revised manuscript) based on our findings.

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)	