

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129201
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Literacy for Rural Women: Pathways to Empowerment and Socioeconomic Inclusion
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	This is a contemporary research problem, especially for countries from global south either in the form of gender, ethnic or class based of digital disparity, which needs to be studied more. Therefore, no doubt, this topic is a significant for scientific community, policies makers and global humanitarian organizations, but with good research design and scientific research execution. All in all, this review identifies key challenges to digital literacy for rural women, it could be more effective if researcher analyzed deeper in the form of exploration of the inter-sectionality of these barriers, such as how age, caste or class may further complicate access.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is needed some additional socio-economic, political and critical analysis factors and variables or mediating variables not only to help the reader to comprehend the area of work, but also ensure it as a catchy scientific work.	
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 methodological and theoretical design is not clearly mentioned and used, so it is needed to give a touch on these areas, and also problematize the area of work in a rational ground.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	However, the area of study selected by the researcher is good, but the pattern or method used for reviewing this study is a little bit weak. To understand the phenomena of the digital disparity, digital literacy, including its causes, opportunities, and challenges, it is necessary to use triangulative methods, SWOT model, theoretical debates, and various levels of analysis. Gender level of analysis, urban and rural comparisons, and models should be employed to analyse the data effectively.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are somehow old. There are some updated material on this. 1. Burxanova, Z. (2024). EMPOWERING WOMEN: BRIDGING THE DIGITAL DIVIDE THROUGH COMPUTER LITERACY. Евразийский журнал академических исследований, 4(5 (Special Issue)), 318-321. 2. Aslam, A., Abidi, S. N. M., & Rizvi, S. S. A. (2024). Digital Literacy and Women's Empowerment: Bridging the Gender Gap in Technology for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies, 24(2), 93-106. 3. Kumar, S., Kumar, V., & Devi, N. (2024). Digital literacy: a pathway toward empowering rural women. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication. 4. Sharif, M., Anwar, M., & Mehmood, M. (2023). Understanding the Lived Experiences of Female Students in.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is good and simple, but still it needs to be written in a scientific way.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Sharif
Department, University & Country	Peoples' Friendship University, Russia