

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_125659
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting the Impact of Natural Disasters, Pandemics, and other crises on Employment and Workforce Dynamics
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript is relevant for the scientific community as it explores the impact of multiple types of crises, such as pandemics and natural disasters, on employment and workforce dynamics. Given the global experience with COVID-19 and increasing natural disasters, the manuscript contributes valuable insights into workforce resilience, job security, and remote work trends. By integrating machine learning models, the study provides a modern approach to forecasting employment outcomes during crises, making it both timely and methodologically sound.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate as it captures the key themes of the research.	
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 quiet good but could benefit from including a brief mention of the specific machine learning model used, such as the Random Forest model. This would better reflect the methodology and provide clarity on the technical approach right from the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, The Structure is good	
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 manuscript is scientifically good, as it employs established methodologies in both qualitative and quantitative research. The integration of machine learning models, such as Random Forest, to forecast workforce dynamics adds technical soundness. The moderate accuracy (0.544) and other metrics suggest a technically sound model with room for improvement, which the authors acknowledge.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent studies, particularly those from 2020–2024. If possible, the authors could consider including additional references on advanced machine learning applications in crisis forecasting to strengthen the technical grounding.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is good	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a deeper discussion of policy implications in the conclusion. No plagiarism is suspected in this manuscript. There are no competing interest issues identified in this manuscript There are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Sahaya Shabu
Department, University & Country	Xavier Institute of Business Administration, St. Xavier's College, India