

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>
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.	This article, as it claims, investigates the caste formation of Bairagi sect during the colonial period in order to understand the intricacies of this diverse sect's transformation into a singular caste. The title is promising, thought provoking and quite inclined towards the academic heights. There is no need to change it. No doubt, the author has an academic writing skill. Over all it is not a bad read. However, the article needs serious corrections regarding certain dates and time period, thought development along with few editing such as spaces between multiple words, apart from this there is hardly enough attempt to follow a standard citation/quotation pattern. The author did not traced much attention to all the references listed, in fact his engagement with the references is not enough with the basic theme and sometimes the author did not even mention some references in the main text. For example in the reference Lochtefeld's writings dated 2001 and 2008 were listed, however Lochtefeld, J. G. (2008) wasn't cited at all, and there are many instances where listed references were cited only once. The developments of each section lacks its own specified objectives and methodological peruse. As for instance the author does not catch up with the various state archival materials as is evident in the main text. Recent scholars have studied the Vaishnava sects and their contribution through sectarian divisions as such sahajiyas, kartavajas, sahebhdhanis, bauls etc. Connecting with these divisions might give much more insights and can be a qualitative approach.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract is a little bit long, needed to be précised accordingly. May be merging both the second and third line would be beneficiary since they indicates the same thoughts and ideas. I have made few suggestions in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections needed further developments. Their titles or headings are seems alright though. However, needs thorough revisions of all the subsections in order to engage with the references.	
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.	The style of the writing is academic and interesting enoguh to consider for evaluation/revision. It is evidently clear that the author pain stakingly searchs for details from various sources. However, scientifically this study of bairagis is neither break through nor adding entirely a new horizon of knowledge rather focused on the already existing field of knowledge. In terms of academic contribution the study has potentiality. Teachnically the manuscript is written by a scholar, although it needed major revisions and much more of author's own thoughts and ideas before publication. The artcle is lack of author's own words. This might be over come by the author if he consider writing few paragraphs and include few sentences of his own based on the sources available.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Lacking referential engagement is among the major short comings of the article. Given references are relevant; however, the article needs further exploration from other references. There are multiple books I would like to suggest. For example Manindra Mohan Bose's book on sahajia vaishnava cult of Bengal, Paritosh Das's writings on panchasakha vaishnav cult of Orissa could help the author to grasp the broader sectarian division within Vaishnavism. These readings can, in order to put the bairagi vaishnav in the frame of the historical process, provide extensive details of the Vaishnava field study. Apart from them the author might take a glance to the writings of Biman Bihari Majumdar, Susil Kumar De. They will help the author to fix historical dates and time period of the Gaudiya movement.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is adequate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Major revision needed before its publication.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Achintya Debnath
Department, University & Country	C.S.S.S.C Jadavpur University, India