



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_54387
Title of the Manuscript:	Stock Market Development and Economic Development in Emerging Economies
Type of the Article	Statistical research oriented article

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>At one place initially, it was mentioned that the sample comprised of Tunisia as well. However, in the entire study only 4 countries viz., South Africa, Nigeria, Angola, and Kenya are only studied. Therefore, Tunisia may be removed.</p> <p>Recommendations need to be revised. For instance, the first recommendation states that 'adequate regulation should be introduced as this would help in ascertaining stable stock market and thereby encouraging foreign participant to operate in the market'. This is incomplete and without complete logic. If the study had found that due to lack of or due to insufficient regulation the stock markets have not developed and resultantly the economic development has not gained from stock markets, then the above recommendation is fine. Still, which kind of regulation should be implemented has to be broadly suggested.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The sentence formation may have to be slightly improved. For instance, in many place, 'increase' is used for 'increased'; 'help' is used for 'helped', and encourage is used for 'encouraged. In each of the contexts the required words were verbs and not nouns. The inapt usage changes the meaning and inference of the sentences.	
Optional/General comments	It is a good effort. The literature review established that the same research work was carried out by many scholars in the past. The difference and justification for this work in contrast to the previous works has to be established.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kishore N.K
Department, University & Country	India