

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJ SSE_98787</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing the Potential Impact of Large Language Models on Labor Markets and Business Cycles in China: A Preliminary Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in thereview form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, it is a novel topic</p> <p>They are proper and according to the need of the problem statement.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>They are sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is a ton of clearness in correspondence. Thoughts are effortlessly composed and communicated throughout. The content is straightforward and worked well and quickly for the pursuer.</li> <li>➤ The language of English is appropriate. It is kept essential, out of syntactic and punctuational bumbles, expressive and practical.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Because the paper is well-informed, well-written, thoughtful, and overall well-organized, I recommend that it be acknowledged. The paper has a clear objective and has not deviated from its primary subject. The author has brilliantly organized the paper, making it easy for the analyst and others to understand.</li> <li>➤ The paper's significant strength is its: the approach to making the paper, particularly coordinated, usage of fitting authentic examination strategy, references suitably inserted, invigorated content and use of essential English with incredible language. The paper is powerful and expressive.</li> <li>➤ As a result, the paper does not have any flaws, but there is always an edge of progress.</li> <li>➤ The paper's title is appropriate.</li> <li>➤ The theoretical is written in a clear and concise manner with the further satisfaction and context of the paper in mind.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abhishek Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bareilly College, M.J.P.R. University, India</b>