

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_112685
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural Transformation of the Indian Economy and its Reflection on the Land Use Pattern
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is essential for scientific community as it contributes to add insight on community and region related issues that can be a good resource for practical improvement.</li> <li>2. The title is considered to have represented the whole objectives of the study and reflected readers' thoughts on what it contained.</li> <li>3. The abstract is structurally good and sufficient. It starts with a brief background, problems, objectives, methods and results.</li> <li>4. Unfortunately, the author(s) missed the literature review and a discussion of related previous studies on it. It may be based on the article's guideline but it had better to add it.</li> <li>5. Structurally the manuscript has followed general articles' guideline and grammatically the manuscript seems to have meet the scientific use of communication. Thus, in content, it seems that this manuscript can be scientifically accepted.</li> <li>6. The numbers of references are insufficient. Good article comprises at least 40 to 50 related references and 20% out of it is recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Grammatically, the author(s) met the standard of scientific writing manner which is considered sufficient and good.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Taufiq Kurniawan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Indonesia</b>