

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_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>

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.	The Indian economy is currently experiencing a gradual slowdown. So, this manuscript presents solutions to the impending problem that the Indian economy may face in the near future.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes However, in case the author(s) find it more suitable, they may use the following alternative title 'Economic Slowdown in China: Lessons for India's Foreign Economic Policy'	
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 author(s) may include their recommendations in brief for India's foreign economic policy in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	1) The study conducted in the paper is descriptive in nature. On several occasions, factual pieces of information are combined with the opinion of the author(s). Personal bias needs to be avoided in the writing and ought to be supported by literature or some plausible theory. 2) An important discussion missing in the manuscript is the logic or theory behind the author(s)'s conclusion about the state of the economies. Based on the trend of macroeconomic data, how have the author(s) concluded whether the prevailing states of the economies are structural or transitional in nature? Why is China's economic slowdown not structural and India's issues are structural? The reasoning needs to be elaborated. The criteria or conditions for categorising a particular condition as structural or transitional have to be indispensably discussed. 3) There are apparent logical and theoretical fallacies in the recommendations of the author(s). For instance, in India's GDP-related section, they write: "The labour force employed in Agriculture, forestry, and fishing signals shifting of excess labour force to manufacturing and services. India's FEP can engage China to advance its manufacturing sector as the latter is in the grip of deflationary phase; that can ensure imports of items in India's import competitive sectors at competitive prices." Here the author(s) say that since the labour force of India is shifting from the primary sector to the secondary sector, India should enhance its imports from China to increase competitiveness in the manufacturing (i.e., secondary) sector. On the contrary, to accommodate the excess labour force from the primary sector, the Indian government needs to adopt the import substitution strategy and not enhance its imports, as recommended by the author(s). Increasing imports negatively	

Review Form 3

	<p>impacts the domestic manufacturing sector. Further, it will also lead to an increased fiscal deficit and an adverse balance of trade for India. However, here as well, the author(s) have a contrary opinion. They mention in the abstract: “It offers useful lessons to India’s foreign economic policy to reduce the trade deficit by importing critical raw materials from China for its import-competitive industries as the latter passes through a deflationary phase.”.</p> <p>4) The findings, recommendations and conclusions in the manuscript are more opinion rather than being theoretically grounded or logically corroborated.</p> <p>5) The author(s) intend to provide lessons for India’s foreign economic policy from China’s policies. For this, they analysed macroeconomic variables like GDP, inflation and unemployment at an aggregate level. Only the balance of trade was an external sector variable. How do the author(s) make conclusions about China’s external sector policies from their aggregate macroeconomic variables and make recommendations for India’s foreign policy? Analysis of foreign policy requires the use of external sector variables.</p> <p>6) The macroeconomic variables of India and China have been compared to derive conclusions, which may not be appropriate because of substantial differences in the economic structure of both economies coupled with differences in the methodology of data collection and derivation of the values of the concerned variables. These aspects have to be acknowledged and taken into consideration while performing comparative analysis.</p> <p>7) A precise data description has not been provided. For instance, is GDP real or nominal? Which measure of inflation has been used, consumer, producer or deflator?</p> <p>8) The methodology section mentions: “Both primary and secondary sources will be utilised.”, however, I was unable to trace any primary data in the manuscript.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Although, several news articles have been used as references. Instead of citing news articles, directly cite the data to which the news articles are referring.</p>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>1) The major part of the paper is written in op-ed style instead of academic style. Statements like “They want desk jobs, staring at computers. But that’s not possible (Hoskins 2023).” (Page 10 of the manuscript) are to be avoided.</p> <p>2) In the “Methodology” section, future tense has been used (Eg: “The proposed study will be conducted...”). The entire section needs to be reframed in the past tense.</p> <p>3) Using “New Delhi” and “Beijing” instead of India and China respectively is technically incorrect and it may even confuse the readers. Since regional as well as national macroeconomic data exists, using the name of a region instead of the country’s name makes your statements ambiguous along with being technically incorrect in an academic paper.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>There are several technical weaknesses coupled with a lack of academic rigour in the manuscript. Currently, the manuscript requires a lot of corrections, reworking and restructuring.</p>	

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:	Anurag Bavaria
Department, University & Country	G. S. College of Commerce and Economics, India