

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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It is necessary to understand Economics of language. Lack of official data and extensive research on language aspects and their economic concerns further restrict the implementation of better language policy and finally resolving language issues.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper, which is “ An Analytical Review of Language Economicswith a Discussion on Language Use, Policy and Planning”</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The author also discuss the summary and conclusion in a factual manner.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The authors cite a variety of relevant sources, including recent papers on the topic.</p> <p>Overall, I think the manuscript is well-written and informative. It makes a significant contribution to the field of sentiment analysis, and it is likely to be of interest to a wide range of researchers.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> 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><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Rakesh Kumar Giri
Department, University & Country	Sunrise University, India