



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_50607
Title of the Manuscript:	Demonetization in India: An evaluation
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. Abstract 2. Introduction 3. Tables	1. Author failed to state his position on the issue and proffer suggestion in the abstract. Author should also start with the background on the issue at hand. 2. In the last paragraph of the introduction, author should present the rationale, objectives, marginal contributions and organization of the paper. 3. Although the information presented in the tables are imperative, author should resort to employing academic tables to present the information in more professional way.	1. The paper is a policy review paper and all the information are collected from the secondary sources. The background of the issue was the demonetization initiative taken by the Indian government on 2016 that has been noted on the abstract itself. 2. Done according to the suggestion. 3. The tables are presented and explained properly.
Minor REVISION comments	Author should consider reading the paper from the beginning to avoid unnecessary typos and improve the quality of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	In all, author exhibited fair knowledge of the study area and due justice in logical presentation of his/her arguments.	

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)	No