

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_113304
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends In Inter-District Inequalities of Income in Central Region Of Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript is important to the scientific community because This research is important for science, especially observing the spread of net income per capita using the coefficient of variation because it uses two measures of convergence which rely on neoclassical growth theory, and sigma convergence.</p> <p>Yes it is the title of the article suitable</p> <p>3a. Please rewrote start from The urgency and contribution of research are not clearly explained,</p> <p>3b. The research population, sampling techniques including data analysis techniques were chosen based on whether they were written or not</p> <p>3c. Research implications are not explained, research keywords should be included as guidance for other scientists</p> <p>In general, the manuscript meets scientific standards, it only needs to be strengthened by supporting hypotheses and theories</p> <p>I think it is correct, especially if it is strengthened by a strong problem background and adequate research references</p> <p>6a. Use strong references and literature for each editorial so that the theoretical fundamentals are clear, complete with the year of quotation</p> <p>6b. Avoid using references that are more than 5 years old, if the grand theory quotation must be based on the latest research</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to use Proofread to strengthen the quality of the article</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is good, but it needs to clarify the flow of sample selection and data collection techniques, including the instrument of questions asked to respondents so that the research results are good. It needs to be supported by the latest references. It can be seen in this manuscript that the reference source is more than 10 years old.</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:	Renea Shinta Aminda
Department, University & Country	Ibn Khaldun Bogor University, Indonesia