



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	<p>The paper reports the results of an interesting and topical study. The authors use a qualitative phenomenological method to explore experiences of eleven (11) Persons Under Investigation (PUIs) and fourteen (14) Persons Under Monitoring (PUMs) during General Community Quarantine. However, I have some reservations I'd like the authors to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to contact and choose PUIs and PUMs for the interview? Are the respondents random and able to be represented for the research? When is the time of the interview? - The study was limited to 11 Persons Under Investigation (PUIs) and 14 Persons Under Monitoring (PUMs). This is too few for the research like this. How many PUIs and PUMs in total (in Philippines) now? - The authors list one respondents at 1 year-old. How the respondent can answer the interview? - The qualitative phenomenological study not provide any data and responses so very difficult to estimate the methodology of the research. - What are the core claims of the paper? These are not clearly conveyed in the abstract and conclusions <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	La Viet-Phuong
Department, University & Country	Phenikaa University, Vietnam