



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_66330
Title of the Manuscript:	Lived Experiences of Persons Under Investigation (PUIs) and Persons Under Monitoring (PUMs) During General Community Quarantine (GCQ)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "In addition, people in all walks of life experienced a prolonged period of uncertainty and unrelaxed brought" – it seems that some word is omitted between words "unrelaxed" and "brought".</li> <li>2. It would be good to add "literature review" section to show any previous background to this research and existing research gaps. Otherwise, it is hard to understand whether the research is innovative or not.</li> <li>3. "This study utilized a qualitative phenomenological research design. This phenomenological research design. This method attempts to understand people's experiences in certain phenomenon." – it seem that the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence in the section 2.1 is not fully written. Please write it fully.</li> <li>4. It is also worth mentioning the geography of the respondents, are all of them from Manila, or they are from different regions of Philippines?</li> <li>5. In section 3 (results &amp; discussion) – mainly results from interview are listed. I believe that discussion should be widened. For example, some statistical analysis (e.g. EFA, CFA, etc.) could be added, showing that most of the experiences of PUIs and PUMs were leading to negative consequences of mental health. Also, the experience between PUIs and PUMs could be compared between each other – e.g. which category suffered more. It is also interesting to see some statistics in tables – e.g. the percentage of people being discriminated, and so on. Having this amount of data, you could present it in a more developed form of discussion.</li> <li>6. It would be good to add into "Results and discussion" section some visualisations, for example, graphs showing the variance of the obtained responses. These could be added into each of the subsections of Section 3 "Results and discussions".</li> <li>7. In the limitations please also add the geographical limitation – is it only the country limit or some specific region or even city limit?</li> <li>8. Mentioning that 11 PUIs and 14 PUMs meet a saturation point of the interview, you should also present some proofs that this amount of data interviews indeed meets a saturation point. It could be added in methodology and/or results&amp;discussion.</li> <li>9. If you add some statistics into discussion, you could present more precise conclusions of your study. I advise you to update it with some factual data.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the abstract (1<sup>st</sup> sentence) it is better to show the abbreviation of person Under Monitoring the first time you mention it – in the first sentence, not in the second one.</li> <li>2. In the Keywords after GCQ abbreviation you forget to put the closing bracket</li> <li>3. "In addition. People were advised to wear Personal Protective Equipment [3]." – after phrase "in addition" should be a comma, not a point; people should not be written with capital letter.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Did your study undergo any ethical committee? It is worth mentioning that in the end of the research (e.g. which committee, the number of the decision case etc), as your study involved personal questions and even child of 1 year old was included into the respondents.</li></ol>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aidana Tleuken</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Engineering and Digital Sciences, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan</b>