

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJASS_127987 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Navigating Adversities: A Systematic Literature Review of Challenges Faced by Transgender Individuals |
| Type of the Article | Systematic literature review |

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is a systematic literature review on the challenges of social integration of transgender people in the specific context of India and Pakistan. Its interest lies in the fact that it covers an abundant literature, selected on the basis of rigorous criteria. This synthesis of the literature reveals what is known on the question investigated. However, it would have been nice if we also saw a section of the manuscript addressing the shortcomings of this literature and proposing directions for future research. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is indeed related to the scientific project of the paper. However, I believe that the authors should add the social context concerned by their systematic literature review: India and Pakistan. As the title is currently presented, it suggests that the phenomenon investigated is of global scope. It is therefore necessary to specify in the title that the systematic review concerns these two countries. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | I think that overall, the authors have made efforts to ensure the scientific nature of their investigations, as evidenced in particular by the process by which they selected the publications included in the systematic review. We know that in this type of exercise, the quality of the papers on which the review is based is crucial to do justice to the literature available in a field. My criticism is that the review is too flat, and does not sufficiently highlight the shortcomings of the literature from a theoretical, methodological, epistemological point of view or even in relation to the questions addressed by the selected texts. This aspect seems crucial to me when one can conduct a systematic review of greater scope than a simple review of literature on a field. Similarly, the authors make no suggestions for the direction of future research; which constitutes a significant shortcoming. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | I think that references are sufficient for a systematic review that is known to generally exploit the selected documents. However, they are not cited according to APA 7 standards. There are many referencing errors in the text and in the references. For example, when two authors are cited outside the parentheses, an ampersand should not be used (see for example Yadav & Patni (2019) which should be cited Yadav and Patni (2019)). There are also problems with the way to cite the references at the end of the text, since the alphabetical order of the authors is not respected. These elements must be cited more rigorously. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | I believe that the level of language is sufficient for research of this level and that the language is clear enough to be understood by readers of a high academic level. However, it is important that words in a language other than English are italicized, according to established standards. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name: | Gustave Adolphe Messanga |
| Department, University & Country | Cameroon |