Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_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/

<mark>**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**</mark>

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

Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 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	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	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."	
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 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.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	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.	
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 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.	
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.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed discussion on the policy implications of its findings. No ethical issues are identified in this manuscript. None observed. No evidence of plagiarism was found in the manuscript. The content appears original and well-researched.	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Feyisayo Michael Ogunyemi**
Department, University & Country	**Eastern Illinois University, United State of America**