

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_118673
Title of the Manuscript:	PRIORITIZING INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT TO BOOST REGIONAL GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (GDP) IN SIMALUNGUN REGENCY, INDONESIA
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy> )

### 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>This manuscript is important for scientific community as it consider the economic implications of infrastructure development in Simalungun Regency, Indonesia.</p> <p>The title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive as the methodology is missing.</p> <p>The subsections and Structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The methodology needs to be paid attention to. Author(s) should decide and use the correct method(s) for data collection and analysis for clarity and better understanding of readers.</p> <p>References are few, insufficient and not totally recent. More related literatures should be reviewed.</p> <p>The result section should explain in details the findings of the survey carried out. While the discussion section should compare key findings with previous literatures to draw conclusion.</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 English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Rufus, Abosede Adenike
Department, University & Country	Yaba College of Technology, Nigeria