

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_96687
Title of the Manuscript:	REGIONAL DISPARITIES IN THE LEVEL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF NASHIK DISTRICT A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS
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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/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)	Lesser extent The economic development disparities of Nashik District geographically analysis of regions After amendment being done Lack numbering which can show sections and subsections QUALITATIVE research might be correct References are sufficient for secondary research activity and relevant to the size of the Article Introduction was to be followed by Objectives and study area was to be incorporated into data source and methodology	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is moderate what lack most is sentences construction	
Optional/General comments	Researcher language is different from ordinary language, certain words auger bad in research languages. The author need to use research language commonly used by researchers.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Makkies David Lengwati
Department, University & Country	South Africa