

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127240
Title of the Manuscript:	Towards Progressive Multilateralism: Decoding the Trilemma of State, Democracy, and Globalisation
Type of the Article	Short communication

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic chosen is an interesting concept to gauge the changing role of multilateralism within global institutions. The study has used an interesting method to compare the trilemma of State, Democracy, and Globalisation. However much work needs to be done to make this article suitable for publication	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is very much suitable for the content of the paper.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The second sentence in the abstract seems vague. It is suggested to add a sentence before this on western liberal institutions role and objectives, before saying <i>Neo-liberal institutions, however, promote ontological tendencies in multilateral institutions.</i> Further the second last sentence 'Besides, the study falsified democracy causing trade openness and the simultaneity of government size and democracy' needs to be rewritten for better clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction needs to be separate and the problem needs better articulation. A Literature review section might explain what is already researched for better context and relevance. Problems and challenges of existing multilateralism can be derived in a separate section after Literature. Section 1.2 G 20 role needs to be brought it before methodology. Only the methodology and data correlation can be presented followed by discussion section, where recommendations to G20 can be specified. A conclusion section is necessary to correlative the whole paper and link the conclusions with existing Literature. Further no limitations of the paper not future research directions are identified.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the methodology and datasets are fine technically, the structure of the paper has to be amended for greater clarity of purpose and focus.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Citations are inadequate. In many places, no citations are given where needed. I have specified this as review comments in the essay itself. The work does not look at recent publications in the field. A few are suggested. A proper literature review section is necessary. Steven, D., & Colunga, V. (2023). Multilateralism for the Future: New Challenges, New Models, New Solutions. <i>T20 Policy Brief, June</i> . Woods, N. (2023). Multilateralism in the twenty-first century. <i>Global Perspectives, 4(1)</i> , 68310.	

Review Form 3

	Bordo, M. D., & James, H. (2022). <i>Trapped in the trilemma: When security trumps economics</i> (No. w30506). National Bureau of Economic Research. Kharas, H., & Strauss, S. (2020). Can multilateralism evolve?. In <i>International Trade Forum</i> (No. 4, pp. 22-23). International Trade Centre.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In many places sentence structure needs to be checked for better clarity (See review comments in the paper)	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Radhika Lakshminarayanan
Department, University & Country	American University of the Middle East, Kuwait