

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_101144</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of Employment Generation through Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) in Uttar Pradesh Pre and Post Covid-19.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

### 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript clearly defines the MGNREGS in terms of generating employment for rural people. The scheme provides guaranteed employment for 100 days in every financial year for those who can do unskilled manual work. The study also highlighted that the scheme won't have caste and gender bias but especially able/ disable person didn't benefit much from the scheme.</p> <p>Title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>I feel the abstract can be more comprehensive if the issues and challenges of MGNREGS can be include in the abstract.</p> <p>As per my opinion, discussion part has to be precise so that outcome of the study can be easily understood.</p> <p>I feel manuscript is scientifically correct. The manuscript has been well defining the facts and figures of the MGNREGS in terms of generating employment for households and persons pre and post covid while considering the years before and after covid 19. At the same time, it has also been observed that second objective of the study i.e., to highlight the issues and challenges of MGNREGS in providing employment in U.P has not been clearly defined in this study.</p> <p>Yes, references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>As per my opinion, language quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Susmita Sarkar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jyoti Nivas College, India</b>