SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_119933**
Title of the Manuscript:	**GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN FEMALE LITERACY AND JUVENILE SEX RATIO IN NASHIK DISTRICT**
Type of Article :	**Scientific research**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
The study provides a robust statistical analysis demonstrating a significant negative correlation between female literacy rates and juvenile sex ratios in Nashik District. The strong, significant correlation suggests that higher female literacy may be linked to demographic shifts in juvenile sex ratios. The findings contribute valuable insights to social and economic studies within the region. It is recommended that the manuscript include a more detailed discussion on potential causative factors and policy implications to enhance its impact and applicability. Revised manuscript incorporated all changes except one. Let me explain The interpretation of the correlation analysis results you provided contains some inconsistencies. Let's break down your statements based on the correlation statistics and clarify the interpretation. **Given Results** **Variables N Correlation (r) P-value (0.01 Level)** Female literacy rate 15 -0.79 0.000011 Juvenile sex ratio 15 **Interpretation of the Results** 1. **Correlation Coefficient**: o The correlation coefficient r=−0.79 indicates a **strong negative correlation** between the female literacy rate and juvenile sex ratio. This suggests that as the female literacy rate increases, the juvenile sex ratio tends to decrease (and vice versa). 2. **P-value**: o The p-value of 0.000011 is significantly below the 0.01 threshold, indicating that the correlation is statistically significant. This means we can reject the null hypothesis of no correlation and conclude that there is a meaningful relationship between the two variables. **Issues in the Original Interpretation** • **Conflicting Statements**: o You stated that "there is no significant relationship between the female literacy rate and the juvenile sex ratio," which contradicts the findings. The very low p-value indicates a **significant relationship**. • **Influence of Female Literacy Rate**: o You mentioned that "changes in the female literacy rate do not	**.** **Noted** **Revision made**

influence variations in the juvenile sex ratio." This is also misleading. The significant negative correlation suggests that changes in female literacy are indeed associated with changes in the juvenile sex ratio. **Correct Interpretation** Based on the correlation analysis provided, the correct interpretation should be: --- **Correct Interpretation** The correlation analysis reveals a strong negative relationship (r = -0.79) between the female literacy rate and the juvenile sex ratio. This indicates that higher female literacy rates are associated with lower juvenile sex ratios in the study region. Additionally, the obtained p-value (0.000011) is well below the 0.01 significance level, suggesting that the relationship is statistically significant. Therefore, we can conclude that changes in the female literacy rate have a significant impact on variations in the juvenile sex ratio in the study area. --- **Summary** • **Strong Negative Correlation**: Indicates a meaningful relationship between the two variables. • **Statistically Significant**: The p-value indicates significance below the 0.01 level. • **Influence**: Higher female literacy rates correlate with lower juvenile sex ratios, suggesting an influence rather than no relationship.	**Noted and effected** **Revised accordingly**