

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127030
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Human Development Index (HDI): A Regression Analysis of Economic and Social Indicators
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The introduction is short and is lacking of several important aspects of this study. Why there is no sentences about economic growth and schooling? The author(s) did not include any data, statistics or extra information about the 186 countries	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The author(s) should improve the title with keywords of economics, business or accounting	
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.	There are some English mistakes The abstract should be revised and included the importance of studying such area, where and when this study is done	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, to some or less	
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.	The model is not appropriate The study is not well investigated	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are a lot but not mentioned in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, it is not suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	The selection of several models according to: $2^k - 1 = 2^5 - 1 = 31$ models not only 5 models but the author(s) should estimate 31 modes and with optimal criterion, R-squared, MSE and Cp, the author(s) can select the best model. The author(s) select the model with 3 exogenous variables, but according to correlation matrix, they are highly correlated meaning that there is a possibility of multicollinearity. The study is very simple and does not include any new aspect The discussion and the conclusion are written with holistic view, therefore, the author(s) ought to add some specific and atomistic view to enhance the value of the paper.	

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:	Salaheddine SARI-HASSOUN
Department, University & Country	University Centre of Maghnia, Algeria