

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_119308</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Contribution of Goods and Services Tax (GST) Revenue: India's March towards \$5 Trillion Economy</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes!</b> The manuscript addresses a significant issue or gap in the current economic research, particularly in relation to GST revenue and its impact on India's economic growth.</p> <p><b>Yes!</b> The title accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. It is concise and informative.</p> <p><b>Yes!</b> The abstract provides a clear and concise summary of the study's aim, methods, findings, and conclusions. It is easy to understand for a broad audience.</p> <p><b>Yes!</b> The manuscript is well organized with clearly defined sections. However, improvement could be made on transitions between sections to promote smooth and logical flow.</p> <p><b>Yes,</b> the findings are well supported by the data and the research methods and analysis used in the study are appropriate and robust.</p> <p>The references cited looks accurate and appropriate for the topic. The manuscript seems to have provided a comprehensive range of relevant and recent literature.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality looks fairly suitable for scholarly communications. However, improvement could be made on the grammatically aspect. I can recommend the use of grammarly.</p>	
<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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdullah Bah
Department, University & Country	University of Sierra Leone (USL), Sierra Leone