

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_119933
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN FEMALE LITERACY AND JUVENILE SEX RATIO IN NASHIK DISTRICT
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This issues is very crucial and contemporary issues as gender perspective. In the nature male and female are in equal role and they both have equal human righth and authority in every opportunity as legal perspective. However, it is not fully implemented, they are deprived from every opportunity like politics, education, service etc. Therefore, it is necessary to findout actual female education as gender perspective. Thus, it will be helpful for scientific study. 2. It is best and it may be possible- THE CORRELATION BETWEEN FEMALE LITERACY AND JUVENILE SEX RATIO IN NASHIK DISTRICT as a GEO SPATIAL PERSPECTIVE 3. In the abstract all content are included and integrated in detail. it is need to make it short finding 4. Generally the structure of the manuscript is good but in the methodology chapter there is a lack of research approach, sample size. Similarly there is lack of theoretical review. 5. It is correct but it needs to correct the given feedbacks 6. Most of References and citation are before 2020 and few are after 2020. 7. There is a lack of research gap, philosophical stand, theoretical review 8. Lack of the process of Validity and ethical issues 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It seems like academic writing. It is concise, readable, and academic and its language is reader oriented.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In overall manuscript is ok. It will be better if you clear the methodology in detai and focus on latest citation</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tej Bahadur Khadka
Department, University & Country	Dronchal Multiple Campus, Nepal