

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_113304
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends In Inter-District Inequalities of Income in Central Region Of Uttar Pradesh
Type of the Article	Research 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> <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. <i>This manuscript discusses economic development, growth, and regional disparities in India, with a focus on Uttar Pradesh. The topic is relevant to global issues such as economic inequality and regional growth. While the novelty or significance of its contribution is not yet clear, the structured approach in this research may offer new insights for the scholarly community interested in economics and development.</i> 2. <i>The title "Trends in Inter-District Inequalities of Income in Central Region of Uttar Pradesh" appears to be suitable for an article focusing on income inequalities among districts within the central region of Uttar Pradesh. It effectively communicates the main subject of the article, which is the examination of income disparities within a specific geographic area. However, it could be improved by making it more concise and descriptive, such as "Income Inequality Trends in Central Uttar Pradesh Districts."</i> 3. <i>The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the article's objectives, methodology, and findings. It clearly states the aim of the paper, which is to examine growth performance and convergence/divergence in growth among districts in Central Uttar Pradesh over a specified time period. The abstract also describes the two convergence measures used (Beta and Sigma convergence) and briefly explains their relevance to the study. Additionally, it highlights the main findings regarding the relationship between growth and starting per capita net income, as well as the observed decline in inter-district income disparity. However, it could benefit from a clearer presentation of the specific results and implications of the study. Overall, the abstract effectively conveys the scope and key findings of the article.</i> 4. Ya 5. <i>Based on the information provided, it seems that the manuscript presents economic theories, empirical data, and analysis related to regional development and inequality in Uttar Pradesh. The inclusion of theoretical frameworks, data collection methods, and statistical analysis suggests an attempt to adhere to scientific standards.</i> 6. <i>Incorporating more recent references, spanning over a decade, with a greater volume would enhance the scholarly rigor of the manuscript. The current reliance on references predominantly derived from the past ten years, albeit scant, may potentially limit the depth and breadth of the literature review. Thus, the author is advised to expand the scope of references to encompass publications from the past decade and beyond, facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter and ensuring alignment with contemporary research trends.</i> 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The language employed in the manuscript ought to be refined to adhere more closely to the academic standards expected in scholarly writing. This entails employing terminology and phrasing that align with conventions prevalent in academic discourse, thus enhancing the clarity, precision, and professionalism of the narrative.</i> 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>As per the notes above.</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:	Sutrisno
Department, University & Country	Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia