

**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_122543</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Public Health Expenditure and Gross State Domestic Product: A Regression Analysis</b>
Type of Article :	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 2:**

<b>FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)</b>	<b>Authors' response to final evaluator's comments</b>
<p>After a thorough review, I regret to inform that the revisions have not fully addressed the concerns raised in the previous round of feedback.</p> <p>First, the writing style still does not meet the standards of academic rigor. The research gap is not clearly articulated, and it lacks a comprehensive review of the latest relevant studies. This makes it difficult to see how your research builds on or adds to the existing body of knowledge.</p> <p>The methodology section remains unclear, particularly with respect to the statistical techniques employed. In the manuscript, authors state that "Table 4 displays the findings of numerous linear models used to examine the relationship..." However, the specific technique(s) used are not explicitly mentioned, leaving readers unsure of analytical approach. Furthermore, the equations provided are not accurate or well-explained.</p> <p>Additionally, I am concerned about the limited scope of the variables you've chosen to include. The use of just two variables is not adequately justified, especially given that you have not incorporated control variables which are typically crucial in such analyses. Similarly, the correlation analysis seems incomplete, as you only consider two variables without addressing their correlation with the main dependent variable.</p> <p>The conclusion also remains underwhelming. It does not effectively summarize the findings or provide a compelling closing argument for the significance of the study. Moreover, the choice of estimation technique is not sufficiently justified, raising concerns about the robustness of the results.</p> <p>Given these persistent issues, I regret that I am unable to recommend the acceptance of manuscript at this time. Therefore, I must reject the manuscript based on the current version.</p>	<p>Thanks to the reviewer for the comments and ask to revise the manuscript. However, I would like to response that in the previous version I have revised the manuscript as per the comments received from the reviewer in the first version.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This comment I have clearly defined in the revised manuscript.</li> <li>2. The methodology section is again revised and I think it should be appropriate for the current study. As per the suggestion we can add more things in the methodology if we extend our study.</li> <li>3. Here also I accept the comments that only two explanatory variables is not sufficient to describe the effect. Regarding this we have given justification in the methodology section.</li> <li>4. We understand that the study is not sufficient to justify the relation that we want to show. However, we have given assurance to conduct further study on this issue. I think our future work will incorporate all the untouched aspects.</li> </ol> <p>Finally, I would like to thanks again for reviewing the manuscript and suggesting us for improvement.</p>