

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>

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 manuscript provides valuable insights into the critical role of digital literacy in empowering rural women, particularly in India. By examining various community-based models and low-cost training approaches, it contributes to the understanding of scalable and sustainable solutions to bridge the digital divide. The findings offer a deeper understanding of how digital skills can enhance social, economic, and personal empowerment for marginalized women. Additionally, the manuscript highlights key gaps in current research and proposes innovative opportunities for future initiatives, making it an important resource for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners aiming to improve digital inclusion and support gender equality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Digital Literacy for Rural Women: Pathways to Empowerment and Socioeconomic Inclusion" is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the paper on digital literacy's impact on rural women's empowerment and socioeconomic inclusion. However, to make it more concise and engaging, an alternative title could be: "Empowering Rural Women Through Digital Literacy: Bridging Gaps for Socioeconomic Inclusion". This version emphasizes empowerment while also hinting at the challenges of digital inclusion.	

Review Form 3

<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>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive in that it outlines the main focus of the paper, including the examination of digital literacy initiatives for rural women, the barriers they face, and the proposed solutions for overcoming these challenges. It also mentions the thematic analysis of secondary data and the positive impacts of digital literacy on rural women's empowerment.</p> <p>However, there are a few suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the methodology: The abstract mentions a "thematic analysis of secondary data," but it doesn't provide specific details on the type of data or sources. A brief mention of whether the data includes surveys, case studies, or program evaluations could provide clearer context. 2. Emphasize key findings more explicitly: While the abstract mentions positive impacts on economic independence, social engagement, and community participation, it could briefly highlight a specific key finding or conclusion to add more depth. For example, a mention of the gaps in policy support and resource allocation could be highlighted as a significant finding. 3. Brevity and Focus: The abstract could be more concise in some areas, especially in the sentence about "evaluating the effectiveness of the existing training models to propose scalable, culturally innovative methods..." This could be reworded to avoid redundancy and be more direct. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound and well-researched, addressing key issues surrounding digital literacy for rural women. The review effectively highlights the barriers rural women face in accessing digital resources and the importance of tailored, culturally relevant training programs. The findings about the positive impacts of digital literacy on empowerment, economic independence, and social participation are supported by references to existing literature.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references included in the manuscript are both sufficient and relatively recent, with many studies published within the past few years, including some from 2023 and 2022. These sources provide a solid foundation for exploring the themes of digital literacy, empowerment, and gender-related challenges for rural women. The selected references cover a broad geographic scope, technological focus, and socio-economic issues, ensuring the paper's relevance and comprehensiveness. Therefore, no additional references are necessary unless specific gaps are identified during further review.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript uses formal academic language with clear sentence structures, making it accessible to its intended audience. However, there are some areas where slight revisions could improve clarity and flow. For instance, a few sentences could benefit from rephrasing to avoid redundancy and enhance readability. Overall, the language is appropriate for a scholarly article, but a final proofread for minor grammatical improvements and consistency in style would be beneficial before submission.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the impact of digital literacy on the empowerment and socioeconomic inclusion of rural women. The review is well-structured, addressing key challenges and evaluating existing initiatives. The inclusion of a thematic analysis of secondary data strengthens the paper's relevance and depth. However, there are opportunities to further emphasize the practical implications of the findings, particularly in terms of policy recommendations and the potential for scalability in different contexts. Additionally, more clarity on the future research directions could provide a more balanced view of the topic. The overall presentation of the manuscript is commendable, but minor improvements in language and coherence will enhance its impact.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Zosu Segbenu Joseph</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Lagos State University of Education, Nigeria</p>