
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 11.05.2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 12.05.2016
Manuscript Title: Agricultural polices enhance of development fruits and vegetables subsector in Uzbekistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 131	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Some minor grammar mistakes. I propose to rephrase the title as follows: Agricultural polices to enhance the development of fruits and vegetables subsector in Uzbekistan	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> The abstract is well-written and delivers the main message of the manuscript	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Yes. The paper should be reviewed by the native English speaker. However, the mistakes are not that serious and can be dealt within a short time period. I tried to point to some grammar	

mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> I recommend converting the equation into MS Word format.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> Although the used literature seems sufficient, for the revision I propose 2 more references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The work is interesting and definitely provides new insights on the development in the agricultural sector of Uzbekistan. My main comments are the following:

1. The English is correct and understandable, but needs some improvement. I suggest that the authors check the grammar once more or ideally provide to their colleagues for corrections.
2. One of the comments related to introduction of a short overview of the results of a study on price volatility in Uzbekistan.
3. I also recommend including the World Bank paper on Value chain development in Uzbekistan.
4. For both comments I indicate the literature for citation.
5. Finally, the table which is used for the Results description should be included into the manuscript.

Given these few comments I recommend to accept the paper under minor revision. I believe the revision can be done within a short time period.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper falls within the scope of ESJ and contains useful ideas that can be used for further studies on value chain and export development in the Central Asian region. Furthermore, the paper can contribute to current literature addressing these topics. The English is correct and understandable, but needs some

improvement. This paper could be usefully revised using the comments provided here. Particularly Introduction and Discussions require improvement based on the following:

- introduce a short overview of the results of a study on price volatility in Uzbekistan.
- include the World Bank paper on Value chain development in Uzbekistan.
- include the table which is used for the Results description.

Given these few comments I recommend to accept the paper under minor revision. I believe the revision can be done within a short time period.

