

Review Form 3

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

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript has potential importance for the scientific community, but it falls short due to its poor writing quality and numerous flaws. The authors should carefully read well-written papers to learn the proper structure and writing style of a scientific manuscript. The current paper is not accurately written, and significant revisions are necessary to bring it up to the standards required for publication.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>In the abstract, the authors used abbreviations without first providing their full forms, which may cause confusion for readers. Authors should revise the keywords.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is not accurate and does not align with the standard format for a research paper. It appears that sections of the manuscript have been directly abstracted from a thesis rather than formatted appropriately for publication. Additionally, there are several other flaws, such as the lack of justification for the results. Overall, both the structure and quality of the paper are quite weak and need significant improvement.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The methodology section of the manuscript is significantly weak and contains numerous errors. The equations presented are incorrect, and it is unclear whether the analysis pertains to time series, panel data, or primary data. This section requires serious attention and a thorough revision. The authors need to carefully rewrite the entire methodology to ensure clarity and accuracy.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The authors need to properly use references to highlight the importance of the study. Citing relevant literature will strengthen the context of the research and demonstrate its significance within the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Authors need to improve the language quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The paper is not accurately written, with many flaws that need to be addressed. I strongly recommend that the authors review high-quality papers in their field to better understand the proper format and style for a scientific manuscript. Comprehensive revisions are necessary to improve the overall quality and clarity of this work.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Seemab Gillani
Department, University & Country	Xi'an Jiaotong University, China