

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_98024
Title of the Manuscript:	The Dynamics of economic globalization and income inequality in SSA: An empirical insight from 2STLS and FE approach.
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:

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

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The way the authors have presented the manuscript delivers significant value to the scientific community, especially by highlighting the precautions on globalization strategy and remittances on income inequality.</p> <p>The title is appropriate, but the authors should not use abbreviations. The name SSA, for instance, should be replaced by Sub-Saharan African countries.</p> <p>The abstract captures the background, the data used, the method, and the results and implications.</p> <p>Each of the subsections and the structure of the manuscript is appropriate, and the concepts and results flow smoothly from one subsection to another.</p> <p>The manuscript describes the empirical method and results, together with the interpretations, scientifically.</p> <p>It looks to the peer reviewer that the authors have followed a consistent format in referencing.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Appropriate.	
Optional/General comments	The article appears in professional editing, and the writing is scientifically evidential, and recommends that the manuscript can be published as it is but the authors have to modify the title (should not use abbreviations).	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chai Ching Tan
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand