



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_24403
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Antidumping Measure on Indian Imports of Chinese Raw Silk
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Line 119-122: It would have been better to skip the model above (the one of the non-tariff period) and go straight to this one, which includes the Dummy (D) for non-tariff and tariff periods altogether. Line 126-129: I can't understand why the Dummy variable is included twice in the model. Is $\beta_2 D_t$ a constant? If yes, it should be ignored and be merged into only one constant, e.g. β_1. Why does D_t become a coefficient of t at $\beta_4 D_t * t$? Why not use only one Dummy (D) for non-tariff and tariff periods altogether? The model seems quite confusing. Its theoretical reference/source should be provided. Line 131: Table 4 should be included right here in the text. Line 137-143: The growth rate being similar for both non-tariff and tariff periods, I wonder why speculate otherwise about the tariff period. Moreover, I can't retrieve the specified growth rates from the coefficients in Table 4. For example, the coefficient of the trend variable T is 0.23, meaning a 23% growth rate. Where did you get 26.9% and 25.15% from? Line 148-155: Comments made here are a kind of simple recall of linear regression principles. The insight is quite little. Furthermore, I don't understand where you get the F value 18.63 from.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Only the F value 14.2 is visible in Table 4. Line 156-159: You should indicate where the negative impact appears in Table 4. I guess it is because the coefficient of Dt is -0.28 and highly significant, right? Furthermore, the conclusion relies here on the coefficient Dt whereas non-significant effect was shown above using the gap in trend coefficients between non-tariff and tariff periods. This seems quite confusing. I suggest you present better the model and decision-making criteria in the methodology section. Line 176: The references section is weak. It witnesses an insufficient literature review.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	See in the text	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The regression analysis covers a too short period (10 years), i.e. N= 10, whereas 4 explanatory variables are included in the model. I am afraid this number of observations is too low to run a statistically valid multiple regression analysis.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Barthelemy G. Honfoga</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>School of Agricultural economics and rural sociology, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin</i>