

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_106073
Title of the Manuscript:	Women Empowerment for Sustainable Social Development
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the present manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially when developing countries are concerned. However, I strongly recommend the authors to follow the structure as described in the journal guidelines for their manuscript: Introduction with a review of the literature (please, cite references within the text) and justification of the work, material and methodology, results, discussion (making reference to the findings and to the previous works cited in the literature review) and conclusion. I also suggest authors to be more specific to the target area of study.</p> <p>The title is very general. Taking into account the target area and the aim of their study, I would suggest authors to reformulate the title with a more accurate and specific title.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensible and in line with the manuscript. However, authors should take into consideration: Line 2 of the abstract: : The women have more on less... – Women have more or less Line 5 of the abstract: There is strong intersectionality prevalent in rural West Bengal where patriarchy... Line 6 of the abstract: Beware of double spacing</p> <p>There are sections in the manuscript which are too short, for instance, in the section entitled "implementing positive discrimination" there is only one paragraph of five lines. I suggest the authors to redistribute the information given in these short sections. Also, in the title of these sections some words appear written with the first letter in capital and some others do not, without any specific reason, please revise! The last two sections of the manuscript should become one section as a conclusion, first referring to the findings and the political implications related to gender equality in West Bengal. We do not know if the study has presented limitations.</p> <p>Authors are strongly recommended to improve the distribution of sections for a scientifically appropriate manuscript. In an empirical paper, the methodology and the results are the central part. However, in their article the methodology and the results are not given the required relevance since they are included within a section focusing on women's rights. Also, it is not clear if the data presented are the results of the present study or just data mentioned from another reference. First, a section should be devoted to the methodology employed to collect data and another section should be devoted to the results. Second, both sections should be further developed in detail and not just in one paragraph. Third, the conclusion does not make any strong reference to the findings, just one line in the second paragraph of the section. Finally, there is not any section devoted to the discussion in which authors should compare their findings with prior studies. I recommend the authors to include this section in their paper since it should not be avoided from any scientific paper.</p> <p>References are enough as detailed in the list of references. However, within the manuscript, different affirmations are made, and we do not know if they are the authors' statements or they are ideas from other manuscripts. It is absolutely relevant that authors mention the references within the manuscript. This is also important for them in order to write a discussion section which is absent in the present paper.</p> <p>The references do not follow the style of the journal. I strongly suggest the authors to check the journal's webpage and rewrite them. They also have to check for spelling mistakes.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Page 3, beginning of the paragraph. You put between " the term reverse discrimination (there is one ' missing). If you do so, please do it with all the following terms you refer.</p> <p>Page 3, end of paragraph "Empowerment works as pre-condition": I suggest authors to avoid number. Commas for a numeration in a text are enough.</p> <p>During the manuscript, the reader does not know if authors are referring to India, West Bengal or other countries. I suggest the authors to be more specific in the text and in the title of the sections. For example, page 5, line 26: Women often sacrifice their requirements... which women? Indian, European? Please, be specific.</p> <p>Page 5, line 29: "the rural society always..." Female rural society in West Bengal, you mean?</p> <p>Page 7, line 1: "Women's economic empowerment is the central theme for their rights and gender equality in society" Which society? Indian?</p> <p>Page 7, lines 12 and 13. You use the pronoun SHE but some lines ealier, authors employ the pronoun THEY. I recommend to specify the subject of the sentence first (women, West Bengali women or Indian women) and then use the pronoun THEY.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Despite the fact that the lexicon of the manuscript is diverse and rich, I have some points to suggest:</p> <p>Authors are recommended to avoid the word "thing" and use a more appropriate word which brings more meaning to the text, it appears several times in the manuscript. For example, line 2, in the introduction: But, this important thing is not well accepted... (perhaps you may replace it with "this important role of women in society...")</p> <p>Page 2, line 1: Women prepare meals for all members of their households worldwide. Do you mean in all countries of the world or in India? I believe this is a very strong affirmation, I suggest you focus on the area of study and add a reference.</p> <p>Page 2, line 14: What does SDGs mean? This is specified in the following page, it should be specified when mentioned the first time.</p> <p>From the beginning of the introduction, the authors speak about "in our study area". But the reader has to continue reading several paragraphs to discover that it is West Bengal, and some more paragraphs to know that the specific area of study is Garbeta-II Community Development Block. I suggest the authors to start the introduction or better, dedicate one section specifying the area of study and giving social description so that the reader is put into the context of the study.</p> <p>Authors should avoid using the term "second sex" and choose another one which does not express gender discrimination, which is in disagreement with the topic of their manuscript. Use "women"!</p> <p>Please, proofread for double spacing in the manuscript.</p> <p>Authors use the word "because" several times in the same paragraph, use alternatives such as "since". For example, page 6, last paragraph of the section.</p> <p>In the manuscript, some subordinate sentences are separated in two sentences. Authors should check them, for example, in the abstract, line 5, as I mentioned above. Also, page 3, "Because any society...". It is an independent sentence? Is it a sentence or is it a subordinate clause of the previous one? There are different examples within the text, I suggest you to revise the whole manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexandre Martin Chazeaud
Department, University & Country	Generalitat de Catalunya, Spain