SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_64802**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PANDEMIC COVID -19 STRESS AND ITS MANAGEMENT TO HOUSEHOLDS IN RAIPUR CITY**
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Thank you for giving me to review your manuscript. This manuscript is interesting and scientifically meaningful for considering the stress from COVID-19. Regarding the contents, I have several suggestions. 1. In the abstract, the study's purpose should be clarified more specifically related to the significance of the theoretical framework, especially the evidence gap. 2. In the introduction, there is no clear theoretical framework related to the research contexts to India. To make this study interesting for international readers, the background should include international situations related to Indian contexts. 3. In the introduction, again, the authors should add the gap in the evidence and research question for this research's consistency. 4. In the method section's measurement, the authors should clearly show the contents of their questionnaire as a table or in the text. 5. In the analysis section, the authors should describe which software was used for the analysis. 7. All tables contains the abbreviation, and it can be difficult for potential readers to understand for example, yes or no for what? The authors should add explanations as a footnote. 8. The discussion part should start with a summary of the results and outstanding points of this research. 9. Some English wording is not correct including the non-academic expressions. The authors should consult with native speakers regarding the wording.	All the suggested correction have been done Done Accordingly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*.	