



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_50375
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of intermediary firms on marketing genetically modified livestock products
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Title 2. Abstract 3. Introduction 4. Main text	1. Author should consider re-writing the title. There is no mathematical/quantitative model and data analysis showing how IF impact on GM livestock product. Suggestion: 'Market making and the role of IF in marketing of GM livestock product' 2. The abstract is concise and clear but author need to logically and orderly presents the background problem, objective, approach and conclusion/suggestion. 3. In the last paragraph of the introduction, author need to state briefly the rationale and marginal contributions/significance of the paper. 4. Author should reconsider aligning the objective of the paper with the contents and headings of some sections especially 3 and 4. readers expect to see a section on the role of IF and marketing of GM products.	1. We took your comment into account and changed the title of the manuscript in accordance to your suggestion. Thank you. 2. With all due respect to your opinion we believe that the contents of the manuscript are in right order. Thank you. 3. Done. Thank you. 4. Done. Thank you.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Typographical errors 2. Logical presentation of ideas	1. Author should read the paper carefully and effect some corrections on grammar and typos. 2. In the introduction part, author is expected to present his/her arguments in logical form each sentence/paragraph having logical connection with previous and subsequent ones.	Manuscript reviewed. Thank you. Done. Thank you.
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)	No, there are not.