

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2895
Title of the Manuscript:	A Glimpse on Indian Honey Exports in Global Market
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript is incoherent and it has no well-defined research question to answer. Hence, it is very wrong to use the term "this research" since the manuscript has not lived up to the expectation of being a research.</li> <li>• The manuscript lacked properly defined and explained methodological tools employed to address the research question although the question itself is non-existent.</li> <li>• The manuscript is not important in any shape or form as it has failed to convey any meaningful message to readers. It is also accompanied by meaningless tables and figures. For instance, figures 1, 2, 3 and 4, table 4 are completely difficult to understand and they do not belong to a proper statistical presentation of any data.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the manuscript does not satisfy the bare minimum requirements of being a research product. The only consistent information available in this manuscript is a little description of India's honey production which is also incomplete and quite fragmented to take a consistent understanding of the message. If this manuscript is in any shape or form to be considered as a research product, it should be able to tell the readers what the purpose of the study is, and what approach is used to answer the questions and discuss the results. However, I have not been able to find any of this fundamental information throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Therefore, as reflected in my final marking of the manuscript, I am not convinced at all by the author's contribution to this manuscript as a research product. I strongly believe a small narrative report written by an ordinary blogger or journalistic report could picture a better description of India's honey market at a domestic and global level.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title would have been good and relevant had the manuscript been properly written and delivered what was promised in the title. So, I am satisfied by the title being kept as it is but the whole details in the main body of the manuscript are not good enough to back the perceived expectation of the title itself.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>I strongly suggest the authors rewrite the abstract to make sure it reflects the purpose of the research, methods employed and findings discovered. It is also unnecessary to include the expressions that entailed the detailed data on honey production share of countries in the abstract. Such information can easily be integrated into the introduction section. Furthermore, the statement needs to be checked for punctuation and capitalization of proper nouns such as turkey instead of Turkey. Additionally, it is better to avoid some expressions that are subject to ambiguity. For instance, lines 1 and 2 stated that “<b>Humans and honey bees are among the few creatures that benefit each other</b>”. However, this statement is debatable, to say the least since the relationship between humans and honey bees is not always based on mutual benefit. It is rather perceived as humans cultivating bees for the sake of their production which is not entirely beneficial to bees.</p> <p>In general, there is no indication in the abstract what key question or questions the authors have attempted to address through their work, what methodologies have been employed, what type and span of data is used, and what findings have been discovered through their work. Since an abstract is a brief and concise summary of the whole paper, it should at least be able to tell the reader about the aforementioned information. Therefore, the whole abstract needs to be rewritten and reflect what is in the main body of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to use different colours for Sections and subsections. It shall rather be kept consistent across the whole paper.</li> <li>• Sections and subsections are not numbered and this needs to be adjusted.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>It is a difficult task to make comments about the scientific correctness of this manuscript for the key reasons I have mentioned below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a manuscript, it should have had a defined objective which is completely non-existent in this manuscript.</li> <li>• Had the objectives been defined, the next thing to ask for a scientific manuscript would have been what methodological tools have been proposed by the authors to achieve the defined objective. However, this is again non-existent and simply adding a few irrelevant and statistically meaningless figures or tables does not count as a methodology. A scientifically accepted methodology is something that is described with purpose and reasoning as to why that particular approach is the chosen one to address the research question.</li> <li>• The manuscript is incoherent in its way of transferring a message. For instance, the introduction section should have been dedicated to providing a proper background to India’s and the global market condition of honey. Then, it could have been followed by describing the motivation and purpose of writing the manuscript. Furthermore, the manuscript should have been extended by adding a clear description of the proposed methodologies, nature, type and source of data. However, such information is not included and that makes the manuscript irrelevant and not scientifically important.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>I have no problem with the references but it is difficult to judge the references when the manuscript itself has not lived up to expectations.</p>	

**Review Form2**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language needs revisiting for the whole paper starting from the abstract. I have listed a few examples here and please consider them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction section line 7 of column 1, please change the word 'causes' to some other words that are aligned with the benefits you mentioned before. Use words such as advantages or benefits or importance.</li> <li>• Avoid referencing such as [4-9] in Introduction (subsection <b>Indian honey exports</b>) line 1 of column 2. Instead of using [4-9], list them successively as [4,5,6,7,8,9] if they are all relevant to be cited for that particular idea.</li> <li>• Avoid the use of informal abbreviation expressions such as "<b>haven't</b>" in line 3 of <b>Indian honey exports</b> subsection.</li> <li>• It would be better if the authors write the full form of the acronyms used at least when the expressions appear for the first time in the paper. For instance, FG in line 9 of <b>Indian honey exports</b> subsection, SS andEIA in the <b>sampling of raw honey</b> subsection, HACCP and NSF in the <b>honey processing</b> subsection.</li> <li>• The paper needs restructuring in many ways. For instance, the statement in lines 11 – 15 of column 1 on page 2 that goes as "<i>Because a particular farmer's ...</i>" shows two separate sentences merged without a proper way of linking them.</li> <li>• In column 2 of the first paragraph, there is an incomplete sentence that goes "<i>Since the majority of countries consider finished product findings from Intertek Germany as a reliable resource and pioneer in this industry.</i>" This sentence is not complete, not grammatically correct at all and it does not convey any particular message. Hence it needs rewriting.</li> <li>• The expression that goes as ... "<b><i>When we were on a field trip with the national science foundation auditor in the interiors of Uttar Pradesh, the majority of farmers are statistically significant if they receive between 90 and 105 rupees per kilogramme [12].</i></b>" is not a scholarly research writing way. The whole statement needs to be rewritten. If it is the idea of the research cited on number 12, it has to be reported accurately rather than making a claim that gives the impression that the authors of this paper have been on a field trip with the National Science Foundation auditor.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Generally speaking, I strongly suggest that the authors rewrite the whole manuscript by properly defining their objective, set proper tools to achieve the objectives, and discuss and interpret results with the proper statistical approaches. For instance, the authors could focus on doing a comparative analysis of India's bee honey export to the rest of the world and provide an insight on the possible areas where the different stakeholders can work together and support the industry to fulfil its maximum potential. In doing so, at least the authors can justify their work by making it a unique contribution and can have a properly investigated fact finding investigation with the help of proper statistical tools.</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Amare Alemaye Mersha</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Milan, Italy</b></p>