



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_29350
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Saving Behavior in Economic Growth of Pakistan
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. I have found a lot of mistakes related to the citation, particularly the names to be cited and the citation style. They should be properly done and checked. 2. The manuscript should be fully proofread before submitting to the journal. I have found a lot of mistakes related to grammar and sentence structures. 3. The long-run ARDL system is okay, but the short-run model should be appropriately reformulated. 4. All tables should be prepared again. 5. All references should be checked again because I have found that some names are cited in the text, but I do not find them in the reference list.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The title of the manuscript should be changed. It should be 'Determinants of Saving in Pakistan' or any other title that is appropriate for this article. 2. In the article, there are many sources of data to be cited. But the author should mention the sources of data clearly. For example, which data come from which source. 3. The hypothesis should be deleted because everything has already been mentioned in the econometric model.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The quality of analysis is likely acceptable, but the quality of writing is a big problem. The whole article should be checked and proofread again.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sothan Seng
Department, University & Country	Life University, Cambodia