

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127142
Title of the Manuscript:	SECTARIAN DIVERSITY TO SHARED IDENTITY: EXAMINING THE CASTE FORMATION OF THE BAIRAGI COMMUNITY IN COLONIAL INDIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>With regard to the Bairagi Community in colonial India, the manuscript titled "SECTARIAN DIVERSITY TO SHARED IDENTITY: EXAMINING THE CASTE FORMATION OF THE BAIRAGI COMMUNITY IN COLONIAL INDIA" sheds light on the group. I noticed a number of errors with the book, despite the author's efforts to emphasize the value of the community within the specified time period. They are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author should try use words like "the researcher" instated of My, We, I etc. 2. In the methodology section the author mentioned that primary data were collected from various State Government Archives, as far my knowledge goes the data's collected from various State Government Archives are considered as secondary sources. At the same time oral history narrated by caste members of Bairagis its self can be considered as primary source. 3. If the researcher takes photos from various plate from like Google, Wikipedia, various books it was his primary duty to mentioned the sources properly. This slandered format was not followed by the researcher in the article. 4. The researcher's main responsibility was to cite the books in the reference section whenever a quotation was given. However, in several sections of this study, the procedure mentioned earlier was not followed. 5. It is recommended to italic words like "Goscyin" and others that are typically thought of as local terms. 6. The author ought to conform to appropriate standards while citing the sources they used to gather those. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	Yes	
<p>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.</p>	I have suggested that more insights need to be addressed in the abstract. It must be modified in such a way that it reflects the summery of the research.	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	Yes	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	I would like to recommend that the editor check into the script's plagiarism rate before the considering this manuscript. Typos and grammatical errors also need to be checked. Author can used Grammarly for that.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Numerous books that are cited in different manuscript paragraphs are not listed in the reference section, making it insufficient. The literature section compulsorily be modified with recent literature. I suggest the author to search recent literature in google scholars and other authentic sides.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the manuscript needs to be improved. Some sentences need to be refresh in professional and scientific way.	
Optional/General comments	Before considering this manuscript for the publication the author must revised the manuscript as per above suggestion. If I see any negative response, I might have considered the manuscript for publication.	

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:	Abhilash Sharma Boruah
Department, University & Country	Bhawanipur Anchalik College, India