



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_49013
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Sector Finances as Determinants of Private Investment in PPP Projects in India
Type of the 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	(1). The abstract is too shallow and incomplete. This is because, it fail to discuss the sources of data/methodology, findings and suggestion based on the findings. (2). Still on the abstract, the paper fail to discuss what make private investment in infrastructure projects more attractive to countries having healthy finances (3).No clear problem statement (4). Check the date of the statement on lines 71-75 and make amendment. This is because, a judgment of 2017 cannot be overturn in 2015. (5). Write out the names of all the authors in lines 185 and 203 e.g Grilo et al (2005)	The Abstract has been revised. Date has been changed Grilo et al could be right as there are more than four authors for the article. Similarly Kim et al (reference has four authors)
Minor REVISION comments	Do proper editing of your grammars.	
Optional/General comments	The paper ought to be on Public Sector Finances as Determinants of Private Investment in PPP Projects in India. But fail to enumerate the said determinants in India. Rather it concentrated on other countries. (2). The work should be concise and direct to the point.	Title of the paper has been changed .

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)	