



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_59296
Title of the Manuscript:	CAUSALITY AND CAUSAL EXPLANATION: The Constitution of Sufficient Reasoning in Social Research.
Type of the Article	Opinion 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	There are no reasons for a massive/radical revision; the paper is clean, it surveys some aspects in the tradition he/she was taught, the tradition of analytic philosophy. The topic is interesting – this I was interested for to read it.	
Minor REVISION comments	The absolutely minor, and maybe not even necessary, revision is pointed in the text.	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Bazac
Department, University & Country	Politehnica University of Bucharest, Romania