



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We say sampling, when we planned to generalized from the sample to the population, as the nature of quantitative study stresses. So, in qualitative research, we should say it participant selection technique rather than sample. • To my knowledge, qualitative researchers are one of the data collection instruments since they engaged in the field. Thus, you don't have to detach yourself from the study site and participants, therefore, you should say I instead of the researcher. • In qualitative research, we should refer research participants because they are not merely respondents. Rather, they interact with the researcher throughout the data collection process and construct knowledge together. In quantitative study, we can say respondents because they simply respond the questionnaires. • The themes are not thick with rich data/information; so, it needs enrichment with data at hand (example, the theme limitation is very poorly supported with data). • Since you already applied the principle of data saturation point, it justifies the size of the participants. So, how it can be a limitation? Rather, you used audio messenger as a medium for the interview because of COVID-19 pandemic protocols; was a limitation of your study. • Limitation should be written after discussion but your study/article has no discussion instead it is results presentation. And you didn't compare and contrast your findings with previous research contributions to show us the new contributions you have made. So, reconsider it. • I the concept of coping strategies of the participants at abstract and conclusion parts. And you failed to tell us this issue in the finding part. Thus, think of it again because we conclude based on the major findings not from our common sense. • Anonymity can be applied for quantitative study because the researcher may not identify the respondent personally. However, in qualitative study, the research has the chance to know the participant, so s/he can't secure the anonymity of the participant. You can keep confidentiality of the information by utilizing coding, pseudonym, reporting in aggregate fashion. Therefore, reconsider it. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was it oral or written consent? Not clear because you have done the interview through audio messenger. • What was your strategy to get the consent of 1 year old infant as a research participant? It has an ethical issue. Have you involved their family, relatives, and legal guardians? Or what? • Write the references in alphabetical order and check its consistency with the guideline of the journal. • You mixed-up conclusion and recommendation. If it works for the journal, it is fine. Otherwise, write them separately. • Fragmented sentence, failing to use appropriate words of qualitative study, misplaced parts of the article, for instance, participant selection technique, participant size determination and etc.... • I like the significant of the study, however what is the real gap identified to be fulfilled? • You clearly communicate us the historical development of the issue at hand, but what was the reactions of the scholars/researchers to the pandemic? • What are the research questions/objectives? • First spell it fully then put the acronym in parentheses. And then use the acronym only throughout the paper/document. • In keywords, putting abbreviation/acronym is not appropriate, if not very important. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it applicable to use abbreviations in the title of your study? I am not sure. Reconsider it. 	
Optional/General comments	All in all, the article is timely and relevant in contributing knowledge regarding the situation of COVID-19 pandemic and its impact as well as possible strategies to mitigate for the scientific community. However, it needs improvement on research methods and some minor modification at finding, discussion, conclusion and ethical issue parts.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alemayehu Gebru
Department, University & Country	Jimma University, Ethiopia