SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
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

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Reviewer's comment</th><th>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)</th></tr>
<tr><td><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</td><td>Abstract- Social research does not accept paragraph instead. Please make it a single paragraph.

Secondly, the abstract is too long try to condense your abstract to 150-200 words only. Include methodology , objective, sample size

Reformat tables in a more scientific way e.g.

<table><tr><th>Country</th><th>Frequency</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>India</td><td>45</td><td>34</td></tr><tr><td>China</td><td>50</td><td>23</td></tr><tr><td>Brazil</td><td>23</td><td>15</td></tr></table>
It is not necessary to list your objectives just incorporate one or two in to your abstract and at end tail of your introduction. Line 115-119

Line 155 should be results and discussion not only results
Line 318. The title figure should be below the figure.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	➢ The whole structure of the manuscript and the obtained is all from secondary data. There is no originality in the manuscript. ➢ The time series of the data collection is far away almost more than 2 decades, it would have been more appropriate to 5years series data or at most 10 years. ➢ Paragraphs are many and do paragraphing where necessary and appropriate. ➢ Cross-check the paper and make necessary adjustments ➢ Please cross-check the references	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Gambia**