

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_101144
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Employment Generation through Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) in Uttar Pradesh Pre and Post Covid-19.
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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>1. The topic's likeability to gain interest over time presents a positive outlook as the subject seeks to expand on the imperativeness of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) as a drive towards better resilient and sustainable livelihoods from a Pre and Post Covid-19 lens, under the case of Uttar Pradesh in India.</p> <p>2. Title is fairly suitable but can be revised for more grounded focus.</p> <p>3. Abstract needs minor revision.</p> <p>4. Manuscript structure, the author(s) attempted this work, BUT it falls short of proper & in-depth scientific debt and supportive references that a needed to offer comprehensively understanding of this study and boost its chances of publication.</p> <p>5. Manuscript does present as scientifically correct BUT needs some major corrections.</p> <p>6. Refences are very limited (18 ONLY): For the analysis of such as profound scheme (MGNREGS), this study needs a much stronger reference backbone to support its eventual objective (s).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>- Language of debate needs minor revision, tenses & follow of debt.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juliet Angom
Department, University & Country	Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, India