

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118396
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analytical Review of Language Economics with a Discussion on Language Use, Policy and Planning in Sri Lanka
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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>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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. No. Suggested title: "An Analytical Review of Language Economics: Examining Language Use, Policy, and Planning in Sri Lanka"</p> <p>3. No, the abstract of the article is not comprehensive. Methodology part can be added to the abstract, and the study's purpose should be included in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. To some extent, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. Try to add a few studies from 2023.</p> <p>There is no analysis part, it would be good if the author added some analysis in the form of tables and graphs.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anupam Chanda
Department, University & Country	Bahona College, India