

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_95513
Title of the Manuscript:	Valuers' Perception on Mitigating Material Uncertainty in Property Valuation
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalsajssse.com/index.php/SAJSSSE/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)	The paper is scientific though the method is descriptive where perceptions were identified. It could have been better if the researchers made an effort to do triangulation. The title speaks of the content, it is suitable. The thoughts in the abstract are logically presented. The organization of sections and subsections were evident. The statistical methods are correct but since it is perception based, the correctness can not be determined since perception can neither be evaluated as correct or incorrect. References are good but may consider checking the secondary citations if the original is too classic (old).	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language use is fine but it is recommended to have this undergo stylistics and editing.	
Optional/General comments	Describe the validity and reliability of the tool. Discuss also whether the data is drawn from a normally distributed population to determine the appropriateness of inferential statistical tools employed.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dennis G. Caballes
Department, University & Country	The National Teachers College, Philippines