



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_44788
Title of the Manuscript:	Japan's Demographic-Momentum on a Deflationary Spiral Tracing a Path toward Extinction: Ecological Economics of a Declining Population
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors would have to update the manuscript with adequate relevant literature to enrich the background to the study. As it stands now, the paper lacks relevant supporting literature review.</li> <li>2. It is recommended that the paper be submitted for professional English editing and proofreading service.</li> <li>3. It is important for the authors to clarify why they adopted the methodology they have chosen for the work.</li> <li>4. On line 108, the author(s) posed the question "What is the Hubbert function and how is it different from the conventional growth function?" The question is however not answered effectively in the work. It is suggested that the appropriate answer be provided for the question.</li> <li>5. The manuscript refers to Korea but does not specify which of them. The author(s) should clarify whether it is North or South (or perhaps both).</li> <li>6. A study of this nature would normally require the generation of a hypothesis and a null hypothesis which would in the end be confirmed or rejected. The paper however does not follow such a trend. Even though in some cases research questions may replace a hypothesis, the paper also lacks in this regard. It therefore quite difficult to understand how the author(s) arrived at certain conclusions. It is recommended that the author(s) will do well to fill this seemingly missing gap within the work.</li> </ol>	<p>English editing and proofreading have been done</p> <p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments raised by the reviewers.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author(s) do not establish clearly the relations between Japan's declining population to those listed below; China, India, US, etc. If the intention is to draw a comparison between Japan's population and the others, then the study should make it clear by making proper comparison and outline the implications the former has or would have on the latter.</li> <li>2. A number of phrases and terms have been put into quotation marks without corresponding references. If these are not meant to be inverted commas, then their usage should be minimised as much as possible, especially when they are used with phrases.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper promises an interesting discussion. If the author(s) would undertake the necessary corrections, it promises to be an insightful paper.	

**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)	