

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJ SSE_118978 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Exploring for the change in change of employment status over time. |
| Type of the Article | |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes, It is.</p> <p>I prefer a changed title. (For example: Dissimilar developmental paths in employment status of individuals.)-if the author(s) is (are) agree.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, the structure is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient, and the work is argued.</p> <p>Pay attention to spacing (I have marked in green where it is necessary to insert/remove space). The explanation of the tables is positioned above the tables.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, it is. But, at page 5, I've marked with red colour an incorrect word...</p> <p>Pay attention to spacing (I have marked in green where it is necessary to insert/remove space)</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General 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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Papadatu Carmen-Penelopi |
| Department, University & Country | "Dunarea de Jos" University, Romania |