

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_101420
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF DEMONETIZATION ON THE INDIAN ECONOMY
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://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)
<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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper has an interesting topic and method and totally I Suggest that for publishing with Minor revision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the topic and area of study could be important and interesting for scientific community. Yes, it is good, but it only has an English academic writing problem. Yes, didn't find any problem in abstract structure and it supports the whole paper. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. There are some writing errors covers issues like determiner errors, grammar, preposition usage, spelling, and unclear phrasing. The reference is not sufficient and needs more new and more additional references to update and validate of the article more. It looks like you have fewer references than recommended. For original research, it is recommended to have at least 25 references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, there are some writing errors covers issues like determiner errors, grammar, preposition usage, spelling, and unclear phrasing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ismael Rezaeinejad
Department, University & Country	People's Friendship University of Russia, Russia