

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128842
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement of the Level of New Quality Productivity in China and Analysis of Regional Differences
Type of the Article	Empirical research (Quantitative) 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Useful article with broad implications to all developing countries, regions with insights to reduce the regional disparities through Optimizing Human Capital Structure, promoting Regional Coordinated Development and Leveraging the Agglomeration Effect.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title is suitable however the author can refine it further to make it more representative. Suggested Title: Analytical Study of Regional Disparities in New Quality Productivity across different provinces in China	
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.	Few suggestions to make the abstract more comprehensive: 1. Write in brief the significance of the study to national economy. 2. Scientific explanation behind selecting 30 provinces for study and not Special Administrative regions, Autonomous regions and Municipalities in brief (which is already mentioned in 2.3 data source) 3. It is important to mention the data collection and normalization method used	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Few suggestions 1. Put comma in Intext citation for eg. (Jiang et al. 2024) should be written as (Jiang et al., 2024). 2. For Table 1., write the (source as Author's Contribution), if the scale is developed by author. 3. There is a mention of Northeastern regions in abstract while the data is missing in Fig.2. and Fig. 3	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No	

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Jayashree Patole</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>Dr.D.Y.Patil Vidhyapeeth,Pune, India</u>