Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_130862**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Populism – a bane for India?**
Type of the 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/

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**The abstract is too scanty and those not convey the results of the analysis conducted and conclusion. The author only wrote the summary background and aim of the study in the abstract. No result and conclusion/policy implication.** **There is no review of related work and the introduction didn't contain any and if it is a new area of study, then the author should justify that.** **The methodology section is completely empty. There is no specific research method used and no information on how the data is collected and how it was validated for reliability. The author only wrote that secondary data was used but didn't state that the approach is quantitative research method and the reason for choosing the period under review which could be based on the available dataset. Then the author should check the reliability of the dataset using the skewness and kurtosis or simply test the normality of all the variables. All this should be implemented to strengthen the work.** **The fig 1 to fig 25 was not label. For example, Fig 1: Graph showing the fiscal balance from 2001 to 2023 and soon for other figures.** **There is no conclusion and Policy implication/recommendation section.** **There are no valid empirical references.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes**	

Review Form 3

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 abstract is too scanty and those not convey the results of the analysis conducted and conclusion. The author only wrote the summary background and aim of the study in the abstract. No result and conclusion/policy implication.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	**The paper should only be accepted if all the comments I stated above are adequately attended to** **My Comments:** **The abstract is too scanty and those not convey the results of the analysis conducted and conclusion. The author only wrote the summary background and aim of the study in the abstract. No result and conclusion/policy implication.** 1. **There is no review of related work and the introduction didn't contain any and if it is a new area of study, then the author should justify that.** 2. **The methodology section is completely empty. There is no specific research method used and no information on how the data is collected and how it was validated for reliability. The author only wrote that secondary data was used but didn't state that the approach is quantitative research method and the reason for choosing the period under review which could be based on the available dataset. Then the author should check the reliability of the dataset using the skewness and kurtosis or simply test the normality of all the variables. All this should be implemented to strengthen the work** 3. **The fig 1 to fig 25 was not label. For example, Fig 1: Graph showing the fiscal balance from 2001 to 2023 and soon for other figures** 4. **There is no conclusion and Policy implication/recommendation section** 5. **No valid empirical references**	

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:	**Seun Adebanjo**
Department, University & Country	**Nigeria**