



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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>TITLE: the current title is overly technical and indeed there appear to be two distinct titles (one in ScholarOne and one on page 1 of the manuscript itself). A more legible title might read "Investigating the roots of Hijra human rights violations"</p> <p>ABSTRACT: You need to craft a 200 word abstract that lays out the problem, approach, and findings in a simple manner (please take a look at other articles in JHR and model your abstract on it). This means synthesizing into one succinct, accessible paragraph the material that you currently have arrayed on page 1 in scientific research style (i.e., you have sections labeled "Backgrounds, Methods, Results, Conclusions") – combine these but you won't have space for the line-by-line results here and will need a simple line on main findings within the abstract (non-technically stated).</p> <p>OPENING SECTION: you would need to revise pages 1-6 to be more coherent; the material on page 5 ("Since the late 20th century...") seems the natural place to start; move up some of the broader (qualitative) literature and contemporary policy change analysis that occurs presently on pages 20-23 in order to frame the entire inquiry more clearly. Briefly explain the historical underpinnings of comparative religious/cultural interpretations and sanctions on the role(s) of people within this group. The opening section would then need to culminate with a clear problem statement that motivates the empirical inquiry (what are the specific rights at risk, what practices relate to them, where are there variations to be tested in causal relationships that predispose individuals to be more/less likely to experience abuse?)</p> <p>METHODS: this section doesn't lay out the main research question (it is not enough to say "Data collection tools focused on the main values of the specific categories of violations listed on page are so broad and underspecified that it's unclear how such violations would be operationalized; the questionnaire contents in Table 1 could be the proxies but you are assuming that the reader can intuit which actions relate to which rights violations and how they are relatively measured – rather than explaining that). Simply presenting the statistical findings isn't enough for an interdisciplinary audience.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Taha Husain
Department, University & Country	Begum Rokeya University, Bangladesh