

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_99990
Title of the Manuscript:	Coins of the contemporary period of Afghanistan
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article is written on a historically interesting topic, explaining in depth what is related to the minting of the region. The article is written on a historically interesting topic, explaining in depth what is related to the coins of the region.</p> <p>Better structuring of the article would support the development of a scientific article. The abstract should include the purpose and a few sentences about the results.</p> <p>The author(s) have basically only used an introduction and a conclusion. The source material could be structured, all source references should be added correctly. Sometimes there are long passages of text from a single source. A few sub-chapters could be prepared based on the existing sub-headings, while examples presented as long lists could be avoided, they could be better formatted.</p> <p>Illustrative drawings must all be signed and correctly referenced in the text. In summary, it would be possible to find out what is special in the research results of the article, what is new, and at the same time, how to proceed or what is being investigated.</p> <p>Compile the list of sources according to the instructions, not as a list.</p> <p>When preparing the article, also observe the recommended line spacing.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language is clear, simple vocabulary.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Interesting topic. Recommendation to follow the guidelines and change the structure of the article, add the research results to the summary, organize the referencing and the list of sources. Comparisons can be introduced.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maarika Veigel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tallinn University, Estonia</b>