

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)
<p>Compulsory 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 the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript important to NATIONAL scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically not correct, since very few experimental data are given and only those obtained by other researchers.</p> <p>The literary sources cited (references) are fairly recent, but their number is very limited (only 12 in total).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article submitted for review is twofold. Firstly, this is a purely review article on publications by other authors. Secondly, an attempt to apply mathematical processing of the experimental data not given makes it partly exploratory. In my opinion, the authors should significantly rework the material. Add the experimental data that they received in THEIR research and expand the list of literature sources used.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yakov G. Verkhivker
Department, University & Country	Odessa Technological University, Ukraine