



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_26687
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of MGNREGA on quality of life of MGNREGA beneficiaries in Punjab
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Topic: The topic is repetitive. It can be rephrased as follows "The impact of MGNREGA programme on the lives of beneficiaries". Abstract: The abstract is too long. It should be a summary of the study in not more than 250 words at most. Keywords: Keywords should also include the important variables in the study, e.g. sanitary conditions, education, etc. Introduction: There is no connection between sentences. For instance, lines 43 and 44 do not connect with lines 45 and 46. The same thing applies to the lines that follow. The variables under discussion are disjointed. It could have been more better if the author(s) have listed the challenges that are facing India and then discuss them. Furthermore, there is no single referencing supporting the arguments other than Anonymous (2015a), which also says nothing as far as academic work is concerned. In line 62 the author(s) mentioned some programmes that the Sixth plan included. However, this comes out of nowhere. There is no leading statement or discussion to this. There is also no referencing or acknowledgment of	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the source of information of these programmes. This work is lacking referencing. For instance, from line 72 – 79, sources should have been acknowledged. In line 111, a new sub-heading should be inserted to capture the discussions that follow. At present, the sentence starting in this line is not linked to anything. It just comes out of nowhere. The sentence in line 130 is in isolation. And says nothing. One would wonder whether it is an objective or what. And if it is an objective, why does it come in the middle of the paper Material and Methods: The paper does not show the data collection techniques, and the approaches used in the study. The population is also not shown. The sources of data are also not mentioned. A subheading should be inserted between line 151 and 152. I can see that from line 152, the author(s) is analysing data, but without figures or statistics. One cannot see how many beneficiaries said their lives changed for the better after joining the project. The discussion here is generalising and that is not correct, not everybody used the open space as a toilet. What is lacking in the paper: This paper is too brief, and does not discuss the major theories of rural development. The introduction is based on the assumptions of the author(s). There is no literature supporting this. The author(s) should have discussed the different rural development strategies in developing countries or in some Asian countries. Rural	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	development programmes and policies can be traced as far back during the colonial period till the post colonial era. They can also be discussed according to the different decades. And show how they impacted on the lives of the people. The author(s) should have also discussed the rural development programmes and policies implemented by the Indian government starting from the colonial period also. The author(s) have not discussed the main role of MGNREGA in relation to rural development. After reading this paper, I could not tell the activities of this rural development programmes, and how people were employed. The author(s) should have provided more details about the programme. It is shown by the authors that the MGNREGA has improved the lives of people because they have acquired some more asserts after joining. I appreciate that MGNREGA has improved the lives of the people, but it is the incomes obtained from this programme that have improved the lives of people. People can earn the same incomes but use them differently. Some people can perceived the incomes not enough to improve their lives. Therefore, the author(s) should be more analytical in this regard. They argue as if everybody benefited from the programme. I can also suggest that, this programme should be compared with others as far as impact on the lives of people is concerned. I think there are some programmes that have positive impact on the lives of people.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some spelling and grammatical errors in some places.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The acronym MGNREGA should have been defined earlier in the paper. The author(s) only describe the acronym in lines 81 and 88. This paper should have separated some variables and discussed them individually showing the percentage of people. For instance, the employment, health, education, sanitation, etc should form separate variables under investigation. These variables should be discussed logically and be supported by the quantitative and qualitative data. At present, the authors are generalising. The use of chi-square is not helping in this paper. The use of statistics can be much better and make the paper more comprehensive.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tsepiso A. Rantso</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Development Studies, National University of Lesotho, Lesotho</i>