

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_106082
Title of the Manuscript:	Necessities of Social Vulnerability and Gender-Related Development Policies in Post COVID-19 India: A Theoretical Study of Purulia District, West Bengal
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This manuscript is an interesting topic, but I have some concerns and suggestions for the authors to improve the manuscript further.</p> <p>Motivation for the Paper. As currently designed the manuscript does not highlight a gap in the literature that is truly warranted and novel. I appreciate your study but you need to motivate its need more clearly. A paper needs to be motivated by a true need – something that is both absent and critical in the literature. You need to use prior literature to tell us what has been done previously in this area and then highlight what you propose it both new and important.</p> <p>Theoretical Building & Hypothesis Development. As currently constructed true theory building and hypothesizing is absent in your work. Your modeling and choice of variables needs to be based upon theory and clear hypotheses development. You need clear rationales for what variable you chose.</p> <p>Lack of Tension. Related to the motivation concern, scholarly research often needs some tension or opposing points of view. You do not draw out the tension in the current scholarly conversation.</p> <p>There is a lack of critical synthesis of the studies reviewed in the literature review, i.e., the literature review appears to be descriptive rather than a critical analysis of the examined studies. Furthermore, it is suggested that importance of COVID-19 in Introduction section. Authors can use the following references for improving the aim of study:</p> <p>Ghadermarzi, H., Ataei, P., Mottaghi Dastenaee, A., & Bassullu, C. (2023). In-service training policy during the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of the agents of the farmers, rural people, and nomads social insurance fund. <i>Frontiers in Public Health</i>, 11:1098646.</p> <p>Moradhaseli, S., Ataei, P., Karimi, H., & Hajialiany, S. (2022). Typology of Iranian farmers' vulnerability to the COVID-19 outbreak. <i>Frontiers in Public Health</i>, 10:1018406</p> <p>The Discussion lacks a critical synthesis and comparison of the primary data with the literature. The discussion should connect to the introduction through the research questions or hypotheses and the literature you reviewed. The discussion should clearly explain how your study advanced the reader's understanding of the research problem from where you left them at the end of your review of prior research. Make sure to Reiterate the Research Problem, stating the Major Findings, Explain the Meaning of the Findings and Why They are Important, Relate the Findings to Similar Studies, and Consider Alternative Explanations of the Findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Pouria Ataei
Department, University & Country	Tarbiat Modares University, Iran