

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_106104
Title of the Manuscript:	The plural economy in Africa: the Life ladder equation between economic diversity and breadth of activities
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.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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This study supports other studies so fits with the scientific community. It needs to highlight its contribution to literature and the gap it has filled. 2. The plural economy is mentioned only 3 times and breadth of activities is only in the title. Needs to be re-written. 3. The abbreviations make it difficult to understand if the reader is not familiar with them. I think this paper should be written in the 3rd person only. The abstract has more findings than the conclusion. 4. The structure is fine but cannot have one sentence paragraphs. Appears rushed. 5. There are questions in the general comments that allude to this. 6. Recommended to investigate Gross National Happiness and other studies when the author only mentioned a few (see general comments). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English is quite good but recommendations have been made in General comments.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The structure of this article is as follows: we begin by presenting stylised facts about the scale of life and economic complexity in Africa (section 1). We then review the existing literature to explore the link between economic complexity and happiness (section 2). We then describe our methodological approach to quantifying this effect (section 3). We will then present the empirical results obtained and discuss their significance (section 4). Finally, we conclude by summarising the main findings and identifying policy implications and recommendations (section 5). (Can this paragraph be re-written to remove we, we etc. Should be in the third person).</p> <p>To analyse the evolution of living standards and economic complexity in Africa, we will group countries by region and examine variations over time. (Cannot have one sentence paragraphs).</p> <p>In general, the countries of North Africa (Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Tunisia) saw a slight fall in the life index between 2016 and 2019, followed by an increase in 2020 and 2021. In Algeria, the index of living standards fell gradually between 2016 and 2020, but rose significantly in 2021; in Egypt, the index of living standards also fell between 2017 and 2019, but improved slightly in 2020 and 2021. Libya saw a slight drop in 2018, but maintained a broadly stable life index in the following years. Tunisia, for its part, has seen some volatility in the life index, with increases and decreases over the years under consideration (why and where is your references)?</p> <p>In sum, (In summary,)</p> <p>Happiness research has explored many determinants, but has not taken into account economic complexity (reference)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>(2.1 Did you consider Gross National Happiness as a theory/concept?)</p> <p>These few theories of happiness (why did you choose these and disregard the others?)</p> <p>Method section (re-write without using we – third person)</p> <p>First, as Rodrik (2002) points out. Finally, (where is the second and third points?)</p> <p>4. Empirical Results and Discussion</p> <p>This section presents and discusses the results of the basic model and the robustness analysis. (cannot have one sentence paragraphs)</p> <p>Data section (how did you get access? Is it free or a scripion database? Did you use all data -12 months in the year given? Do you need ethics approval? How is the data extracted? Does the 31 countries cover all of Africa – which countries are excluded?)</p> <p>The conclusion is too brief. It should summarise the entire papers main points. It makes two recommendations which are practical implications. You need to identify the originality of this paper, how you have solved the gap in the literature, future research and limitations of the study.</p> <p>There is no link to the plural economy and breadth of activities in the conclusion and minimally in the paper.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paul Strickland
Department, University & Country	La Trobe University, Australia