

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_97930
Title of the Manuscript:	Overcoming the Inflation Theory: The Battle for Economic Stability
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The battle for economic stability – overcoming inflation - review research article is the theme of this manuscript, which is significant for future insights and potential solutions.</li> <li>2. The title of this manuscript is adequate.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. The structure of the manuscript is good.</li> <li>5. The manuscript represents scientific insight into the challenge of inflation globally.</li> <li>6. References are reasonable, but consider adding a few more.</li> <li>7. This article is engaging and straightforward, but some corrections are needed.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There are many redundancies, missing determiners, and grammatical errors. English writing needs additional work. Some of the words repeatedly appear in this manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Some of your sentences may need to be clarified and easier to follow, so I rewrote them for clarity. I also rewrote some parts of your manuscript, so consider implementing it.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kristijan Krstic
Department, University & Country	University of Kragujevac, Serbia