

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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The declared research topic is relevant and may be of interest to researchers in the field of socio-economic development. However, the content of the article does not reveal this topic. The title of the article corresponds to its content The abstract reflects the content of the conducted research, although the research itself is quite superficial. The structure of the article requires revision (see comments below). From a scientific point of view, the article is imperfect, contains many inaccuracies, and therefore requires correction. The vast majority of sources are outdated; the article uses only two sources that were published no earlier than 5 years ago. Designing the list of references also requires correction by submitting it in a standard format for all positions. <p>Main comments on the article</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article is claimed as an "Original Research Article", but it is just over 1,700 words, while this category of article requires 3,000 to 6,000 words. The "Introduction" section does not reflect the relevance of the study. In addition, this section contains only a list of scientists who have studied the stated problem, and the analysis of the results obtained by them is not given. The section requires correction. References to sources do not correspond to their indexing in the "References" section It is worth supplementing the "Objectives" section with the formulation of the purpose of the research. The data used in the "Data source and methodology" section does not contain references to data sources. These sources are also missing in the "References" section The formulas given in the article require correction. In particular, the first formula in the numerator uses two variables that have the same notation. Also, the designation of other variables should be used correctly: in the formula, they are marked with lowercase letters, and in the description after the formula - with capital letters. In the second formula, the result is denoted as c_i, while in the description it is denoted as CS. The use of four levels of economic development is declared in the "Data source and methodology" section, but only three of them are used later and in the "Result and discussion" section. In addition, ranges for composite scores for the "High development" level (composite score Above 2 Z score) and the "Moderate development" level (composite score 0-3 Z score) are intersected. It is necessary to justify the selection of indicators in Table 1, which are used for calculations. The main result of the calculations is contained in Table 2, but the article does not contain a link to this table. The author (s) should check the calculations for this table. In particular, the last column (composite index) contains values that do not correspond to those that can be obtained by the second formula based on the data of columns 2-9. In addition, the correctness of the obtained values for columns 2-9 requires revision. According to the first formula, the sum of the values for each column should be zero, but this is not the case for Table 2. It is recommended to use the numbering of formulas, this will facilitate the description of the research methodology for its understanding by potential readers. It is necessary to use the same formatting of the tables. It is necessary to submit all the headings of the structural subdivisions of the article in accordance with the requirements. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Svitlana Grygoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnytskyi National University, Ukraine