

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_98927
Title of the Manuscript:	Income Inequality and Nutritional Status of Children in Rural Areas of Jammu and Kashmir: Evidence from Jammu District
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>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important for the scientific community to determine the significance and potential impact of a manuscript. The manuscript contain new insights, data that could advance knowledge in the field, or address important questions or challenges.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article seems suitable as it accurately conveys the main topic and focus of the study. The title also specifies the location of the study (Jammu district) and the type of evidence used to support the findings (evidence from Jammu district).</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive as it includes the main objective of the study, the methodology used, the key findings, and their implications. The abstract also provides information on the sample population, the variables studied, and the statistical analysis used to draw the conclusions. Overall, the abstract provides a concise summary of the study and gives the reader a good understanding of the scope and findings of the research. the study was conducted using appropriate methods and statistical analyses to investigate the relationship between income inequality and nutritional status of children in rural areas of Jammu and Kashmir. The authors used a primary household survey and gender-specific anthropometric z-scores for height-for-age to determine the prevalence of undernutrition among different income groups of rural households. The findings of the study suggest a negative association between income and the prevalence of stunting in the study area. Therefore, overall, the manuscript seems scientifically sound. However, it is always possible for further improvement or refinement in any research work.</p> <p>The study lacks references, it is recommended to include recent and relevant references in scientific articles to support the research and provide a current perspective on the topic. A good practice is to include a mix of both classic and recent references, with at least 70% of references from the last five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript follows standard academic writing conventions, uses appropriate terminology, and has an overall professional tone. However, there may be some minor errors or improvements that could be made, such as grammar or sentence structure, but they do not significantly detract from the overall quality of the language used.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tajalli Fatima
Department, University & Country	GC Women University, Pakistan