



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_50556
Title of the Manuscript:	The validity of Wagner's law in India: A post-liberalisation analysis
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Good composition but the technicality in research is missing. There is no theory yet to prove that GDP can be a proxy for Economic growth (Line 167). Therefore this is a big concern for me.	Authors accept that there is no such theory which prove that GDP can be used as a proxy for economic growth and we decided to replace the word "economic growth" by national income or GDP wherever necessary. This change makes it acceptable in academia.
Minor REVISION comments	On the basis of your modelling you have to revisit so as to capture the main proxy for government expenditure and economic growth. Also trend analysis does not amount to model specification. Please outline your model	Authors have used the variables government expenditure and GDP as it is and have not used other words or proxy words for the same (refer compulsory revision comment). The modelling for the same has been described in section 3.1.
Optional/General comments	You have to bring up literatures that support your assertion else the work currently lacks novelty.	A total of 17 new references have been added in which 13 are between the years 2015-2019. Further, seven (7) out of 17 are from Indian context only which provide recent literature on Indian context. The conclusions are supported by previous studies from Indian context.

--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Not applicable.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous Reviewer, Reviewer preferred to be anonymous.
Department, University & Country	