

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_96091
Title of the Manuscript:	An Econometric Analysis of Economic Development and CO2 Emissions in India
Type of the 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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)	Thank you for consider me as a reviewer for this publication in your journal. The topic is of relevance and deserves publication. It fulfills the targets of the journal. The title and Abstract are describing the work explained in the manuscript in a comprehensive way. Nevertheless, it is recommended to consider the following improvements before final publication:- 1. Please rearrange the equations in an one format on your manuscript. 2. Please indicate your results with other researchers that have the same behaviour in order to support your findings. 3. The results for all Tables and Figures required more explanations, discussions and comparison with other studies is required. 4. Please plote your results by Figures and add error bars at all the Figures on all the curves to show the variation. 5. Compare your result with other studies using a table to make your work more acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nabil Majd Alawi
Department, University & Country	Curtin University, Australia