

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_80439
Title of the Manuscript:	ASEAN Economic Community (AEC): An Empirical Impact 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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1.The research base is not sufficiently developed, the analysis of the literature is weak, it includes only 6 peer-reviewed scientific articles. There are no publications in the list of sources from the last 5 years; 2. The author has not defined a rating scale for any of the analyzed indicators and thus the conclusions are subjective, eg. it is not justified why the assessment is "significant development " in some areas but "good progress" in others and what is the difference between these assessments.	1. The authors partially agree with the reviewer's comment. However, we believe that 6 peer-reviewed scientific articles are not insignificant for developing a solid base and analysis of literature. There were at least three articles that were published within the span of the last 5 years. As AEC is a comparatively new issue, the literature is also limited. Nevertheless, 5 more recent sources have been added to the revised manuscript. 2. The authors have used 17 indicators to assess the impact of the AEC and analysed the trend by comparing the five years after the inception of AEC with the five years before the inception. Since the indicators are different from one another, they can not be described using a uniform scale of measurement. The authors attempted to describe the trend in their own words, and the graph/figure with the description depicts the trend that almost all readers can easily comprehend.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1.The study does not use quantitative analysis methods, no statistical justification has been performed. 2.Lack of comparative analysis with the development trends in competing regional economic formations.	1. The authors attempted to assess the impact of the AEC using 17 indicators and analysed the trend by comparing the five years after the inception of AEC with the five years before the inception. Further study can be done on each indicator using statistical analysis to see whether AEC actually contributed to the change in the trend. The authors kept the analysis simple to reach a broader range of readers and provided food for thought for future studies on this issue. 2. Few literatures in this regard has been added.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)	