



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                       |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <b><u>British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</u></b>                    |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_BJEMT_24152</b>                                                                 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Firm Level Competitive Advantage in the Agricultural Sector: A Research Agenda</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Review paper</b>                                                                   |

**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**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Author's comment</b> (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)           |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>1. Refer to authors' guidelines of this journal to make the necessary corrections about referencing. For example,</p> <p>(a)<br/>-Ismail AI, Rose RC, Uli J, Abdullah H. (Correct)<br/>-Ismail, A.I., Rose, R.C., Uli, J., Abdullah, H. (Wrong)</p> <p>(b)<br/>- [9, 10, 11]. (Correct)<br/>- ([9]: [10]; [11]). (Wrong)<br/>- [9; 10; 11]. (Wrong)<br/>No ethical issues observed</p> | Revisions have been made by adhering to the Journal guidelines as highlighted in yellow.                                                                                                       |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>2. A brief discussion on the relationship between firm strategy and competitive advantage would give further justification for paper.</p> <p>3. Since you mentioned RBV theory, it might be ideal to also consciously add SBV in the 'Porter's model' section of your paper.</p>                                                                                                       | <p>A clear explanation on relationship between strategy and competitive advantage has been provided.</p> <p>The strategic-based view in the Porter's model has been included in the paper.</p> |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | I find the inclusion of such variables as farm size, farm capital, collective action, government support and environmental practices in the assessment of competitive advantage of agricultural firms very interesting and relevant. An empirical analysis needs on these factors needs to be conducted in future to provide a more solid scientific conclusion.                          | The comment has been included in the suggestion for future research.                                                                                                                           |