

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2554
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Rice Value Chain in East Timor—The Consumers’ Perspective
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is essential for scientific community as it would enhance the life standards of the consumers through recommending effective (cost saving and quality) value chain though which customers could get what they demand.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is explanatory from which perspective perspective the value chain was analyzed. However, It is recommended to be revised as “Analaysis of Rice value chain effectiveness in East Timor-The consumers perspective”	

Review Form2

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.	Abstract - Abstract needs to be italic - The sampling technique applied not stated - Line 9-12 in the abstract part not necessary - No recommendation was included in abstract part - The approach is mixed qualitative and quantitative and explanatory design too because there is a hypothesis which was tested regression which is quantitative - Which type of Regression and its result was not incorporated? Introduction - The gap was somehow identified and rationale of the study was described. - It lacks coherence , because in page 2 at the middle , once you justified the rationality of the study concluded with your topic, you put literatures which should be before the concluding sentence (Purpose of the study. Literature - It is reviewed well, - Better to keep coherence, start what looks customers' preference for rice in European, Asian nation and then African nation. This will help to show clearly how preferences differ across nations and continents. Methodology: - Some sentences needs to be changed in to past tense. - Add design, approach used - Data source is not stated - What sampling technique applied to select sample unit from each cluster? - Why big difference among the size of two groups happened? How can you compare descriptive results among them, though there is big difference in size? Analysis and Discussions - Results not triangulated - Conclusions shallow and not show how they could be implemented	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	• The structure is good , lacks conclusion part and results were not triangulated with previous literatures. • The regression model in methodology part and its analysis part are missed.	
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.	• The manuscript is no doubt has good scientific contribution because the results indicate what variables are essential for consumers in the process of buying rice. Hence, the results recommend value chain participants for which factors they should give priority to satisfy the customers with local rice and then locally produced rice could quickly substitute the imported rice.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	-References are organized and written in appropriate way.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is no any problem in the quality of language.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yissa Hassen Kassim
Department, University & Country	Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia