

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.	The contents of this paper can be considered as highly valuable to scientific community because it analyses the quality of China's agricultural exports to Japan, a key market, using data from 2001–2017. It provides insights into long-term trends using the nested logit method and HS 9-digit code data. The study highlights that nearly 50% of China's exports fall into the low-quality bracket, emphasizing areas for improvement. It benchmarks China's export quality against global standards, offering valuable insights for policymakers and researchers.	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)	Although the title of the research paper is good, author can include more information in the title, e.g., inclusion of time period of study, or the methodology adopted in the research paper. One such title can be, A Nested Logit Approach to Analyze the Trends in the Quality of Chinese Agricultural Exports to Japan: Insights from 2001 to 2017.	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 of the article is fairly comprehensive, providing an overview of the study's context, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it can be improved by including policy recommendations.	We have added the policy recommendations to the last sentence of the abstract according to your suggestion. "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.	The manuscript provides a scientifically rigorous and insightful analysis of the quality dynamics of China's agricultural exports to Japan. It is methodologically robust and contributes meaningfully to the literature on international agricultural trade and quality competitiveness.	We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is a need to include more references in the paper especially in the introduction section, where the author has quoted a few datapoints, but the references for those have not been included.	Thanks for your careful checks. We are sorry for our carelessness. All digital sources in the introduction section 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. And, We have added some recent references 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. [2] Yu M, Cai H. Does Free Trade Agreement Alleviate the Quality

Review Form 3

		Upgrading Dilemma of China's Agricultural Exports. International Trade Issues. 2022;(08):136-155. DOI:10.13510/j.cnki.jit.2022.08.001. [13] Long Y. Export competitiveness of agricultural products and agricultural sustainability in China. Regional Sustainability. 2021 Jul 1;2(3):203-10.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Author needs to improve the language of the research paper as some sentences are overly long and complex, which can reduce clarity.	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		

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>	