



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14116
Title of the Manuscript:	India's Export Horticulture Markets in Multispeed World Economies: Trends of Exports, Prices, Elasticities and Policies
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	How is this related to the subject of the article? Introduction, p. 2: Traill (2006) uses various assumptions and predicts that supermarket's share of the 63 retail food market will reach 61% in Argentina, Mexico, and Poland 67% in Hungary and 76% 64 in Brazil by 2015. p.4: There are no or limited studies on market research of horticultural exports markets and identification of major destinations. In Results, p. 8: Export elasticities are signals for exporters to increase or decrease their exports. There are some more not clear phrases in the literature survey. This survey is not focused. This is not correct.	Corrected. Fruits, vegetables are important in living food supermarkets Corrected Corrected in the draft. In terms of Quantity responsiveness to Export prices changes Checked and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The main flaw of Introduction: the novelty of the objectives of the study is not shown. In the section of Methodology the equations are not written in a standard mathematical form, and the necessary full definitions of the used notation are absent. There are no any references for the used methodology. There is no description of data used besides names of the sources – but again, no references available for other researchers. How does this follow from the results? There is no economic or managerial explanation of the results. In the section of Conclusions: just a short summary of Results. There is no any discussion of the previous studies in this subject? No clear practical implications formulated on the basis of Results (remember the word Policies in the title of the article).	Nicely refined Corrected nicely and quoted reference Corrected Nicely refined and practical implications formulated from the results. Discussion done
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Maybe, re-export? This finding seems strange and it is not explained. Usually, MT stands for metric ton. Here, as follows from the context, Millions of tons. It should be defined in the beginning. The English of the article needs editing.	Corrected Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Abstract: The major destinations for India's Rose are ... Ethiopia ... MT	Corrected