

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_129294
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Slowdown in China: A Reality Check for India's Foreign Economic Policy
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: 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.	1. This article does not make any significant contribution to the existing literature on the relationship between China and India’s economic performance. 2. Many of the arguments and findings are general and have been discussed in previous studies without providing any new insights or unique perspectives related to the context of the topic discussed. 3. The research model used is not effective, so it does not provide relevant results. 4. The article does not explain how these findings are relevant to specific challenges. 5. The researcher does not explain the output of the results with a very clear interpretation, so that it can shape policy decisions from China’s economic performance to economic growth in India.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Literature Review: Impact of Economic Slowdown in China on Economic Growth in India	
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.	The explanation in the abstract is not yet detailed, such as the time period of the time series data used, the model used in the research is not available, and the main results are not presented in a clear and precise manner, so that significant and relevant findings can be described.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This manuscript is not scientifically correct in the literature of good article writing: 1. The abstract generally follows a similar structure to the main document, presenting the background, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions in that order. 2. It does not provide a brief overview of the methodology used in the study. such as the approach, type of data collected, and analysis techniques. 3. The main results are not clear and precise, so they do not describe significant and relevant findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are in accordance with the latest and most updated research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the manuscript is in accordance with scientific communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Add a research model to support the topic being researched, so that it can form policy development for India's economic growth, and is worthy of being used as a reference by further researchers.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>There're not</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	<i>There're not</i>	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	-	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	6

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Wahyu Indah Sari, S.E.,M.Si
Department of Reviewer	Bachelor Of Developmental Economics
University or Institution of Reviewer	Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi
Country of Reviewer	Indonesia
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Head of Development Economics Study Program
Email ID of Reviewer	Why.ndahsari@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	+62 821-6350-4851
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	☐ Critical Analysis ☐ Economic ☐ Product Knowledge ☐ Quantitative Research ☐ Market Understanding ☐ Objectivity ☐ Industry Experience ☐ Analytical Skills