

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_98611
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Sector Potential In Bulu Cina Village, Hamparan Perak District
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>1. Yes, but you need to align the general objectives, specific to the problem and with this build the result</p> <p>2. yes</p> <p>3. I missed the research problem as well as the result and the way to achieve the problem, this needs to be improved, but the research has a good topic and is relevant to science</p> <p>4. With regard to the structural part, I suggest that you dedicate part of the text to the way in which information was collected, as it did not adequately present the methodology used, nor the way in which the research was carried out. Another important issue to be highlighted would be the perception of the impact of this production on the economy, and whether this contributes positively or negatively over time, in a collective context, improving, for example, the quality of life, whether in education, technology, science, etc.</p> <p>5. In the part of the results, it is necessary to elaborate a new proposal pointing out the main constructed constructs worked, describing which of these are good, the impact produced in the economy as well as under the social aspect and still verify if the literature corroborates or not with such affirmation, commenting the authors who based these proposed constructs</p> <p>6. Yes, but need to improve and deepen the theme, but if they do this, it will be an excellent comparative research of the value of economics in the community and social aspect It will need further deepening, in this way to establish for each construct authors that support the central theme of the research. Here is my suggestion for authors: Take the corn and rice commodity constructs, check the impact of this crop on the economy and social aspect, checking whether this has a positive or negative impact on quality of life, in terms of education, culture, knowledge and technology. Propose and verify the impact of this in the village, but I suggest doing this qualitatively using a semi-structured research instrument, with a Likert scale form, with open and closed questions Dedicate part of the results to deepen the discussion of the topic, and include a point about the author's perception before, during and after the research, verifying the main findings that were discovered for science, for the academy, for society as well as for themselves authors and respondents</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	no	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Soares Francisco de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil