

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_98949
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on the Causes and Consequences Inter-State Migration and Reverse Migration in Tamil Nadu
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.journalsajsse.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)	While it has some valid observations in the locality, their should also be theoretical discussion backed by literatures. In the review of literature, it seems the author has summarized a paper and put it in section. Instead this could be rewritten to a compelling review integrating all other findings from previous studies not written in section based on author. Its should be comprehensive and critically reviewed. References is not sufficient. References are not formatted in scholarly write up such as AMA or APA 7 th edition. The abstract contains abbreviated words, consider to write the full words before abbreviating like VUCA. The introduction lacks up to date references, consider adding few literatures. The methodology section is too broad. There is no research design, and how is the data collection be conducted. What is the sampling size of respondents? Is this qualitative or quantitative? I assumes its qualitative but in data collection, it is not specific as to how it is done. If there is human involved (I think so) this should have undergone ethics review committee in your institution before publishing otherwise secure it first. There is few citations to back up findings from current literature in the discussion part.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Novlloyd E. Celeste
Department, University & Country	College of Criminal Justice and Sciences, Northwest Samar State University, Philippines