Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_111611**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Role of Downstreaming the MSME Industry and the Green Economy in Supporting National Economic Growth**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it offers valuable insights into the downstreaming program in Indonesia, specifically its impact on the MSME industry and the green economy. Addressing a crucial topic, the research sheds light on the role of downstream policies in economic growth, particularly within the context of green practices. This is of relevance to policymakers, economists, and researchers interested in sustainable development. The findings contribute meaningfully to the ongoing discourse on economic policies and their environmental implications.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is generally suitable as it reflects the focus on the downstreaming program, MSME industry, and the green economy.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract presents a general overview of the research, encompassing the purpose, methodology, and key findings. However, it lacks a clear summary of the specific findings and contributions of the research. Enhancing it with a sentence summarizing the main practical implications of the study would render it more comprehensive, providing readers with a quick understanding of the research's significance.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, featuring well-defined sections. However, the introduction is lengthy and could benefit from a more concise presentation of the research background and objectives. Additionally, the theoretical framework appears somewhat convoluted, and the hypotheses are numerous. Simplifying and focusing on the most critical relationships would enhance clarity.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, employing SEM for analysis.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are inclusive of pertinent and contemporary sources, reflecting the timeliness and relevance of the cited literature to the subject matter. The incorporation of recent and up-to-date references enhances the scholarly rigor of the manuscript, ensuring that the research is informed by the latest developments and findings in the field.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Provide a more detailed discussion of the practical implications and limitations of the findings. Consider adding a concluding section that summarizes the key contributions and potential avenues for future research.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is comprehensible, and the author effectively communicates the research objectives, methodology, and findings. However, there are occasional instances of awkward phrasing and grammatical errors that, if rectified, would enhance the overall readability and professionalism of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Marjan Maali Tafti**
Department, University & Country	**Tehran University, Iran**