Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEMT_38831**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and its Impact on Poverty Alleviation**
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** *(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	1. The title is not appropriate. Author(s) should consider: Impact of Mahatma Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee Act on Poverty Alleviation in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand. The use of possessive pronouns in article titles is not fashionable. Therefore, the use of its in your current title is not appropriate. 2. The abstract did not condense the research paper. The paper had no objective. Therefore, there was nothing to condense. The author(s) only stated the objectives of MGNREGA. The analysis and conclusion can be faulted on the basis of this. The author(s) should state the objectives of the study. The main objective can be inferred from the topic. The main objective is to examine the impact of MGNREGA on poverty alleviation in Pauri Garhwal District of Uttarakhand. 3. There is no methodology and recommendations in your abstract. Abstract should contain your main objective, methodology or methods of analysis, results and recommendations of the study. 4. Line 11: Should read coefficient and not co-coefficient 5. Line 15: Key phrases should be changed to keywords. Author(s) should adhere strictly to established tradition. 6. The introduction was poorly written and should be improved upon. The problem was not stated. In addition, the gap meant to be filled by this work was not identified. Furthermore, the justification for this study was not properly articulated. 7. Majority of the sentences were poorly constructed. The authors should subject the manuscript to thorough correction in this context. 8. Since correlation and regression analyses were executed based on the sample data, author(s) should dedicate a table to demographic characteristics of respondents than just table 2 and table 3 that show correlation and regression results respectively. 9. Line 29: Author(s) should be consistent in their citations. You cited [3] in line 26. The next citation should be [4] but you cited [9] instead. However, [4] was cited in line 30. 10. Line 35: citation of [10] was not consistent. Author(s) should address this. 11. A section of this paper should be dedicated to literature review and lines 41-112 should be moved to it. There are ingredients that should be in literature review. Author(s) should also review empirical literature on this topic. It will be an indication of sound scholarship on their part. It will also show that they know the research frontier – where it all began, where it is now and then where she/he or they can begin or what improvements can be made. 12. Line 69: citation of authors [5],[6] and [7] were not consistent. Author(s) should arrange them properly. 13. Line 73: Normally in article writing, headings and sub-headings are numbered with numbers. For example, 1. Introduction, 2. Literature Review, 2.1 Overview of MGNREGA. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the same number format for itemization of issues under a sub-heading. So, salient features of the Act should be numbered with Roman numerals or alphabets and they should be in lower case. 14. Line 104-111: Do not use bullets for itemization of issues in any scheme. Use Roman numerals or alphabet forms of numbering. 15. Line 127: Should read socio-personal traits and not socio-personnel trails stated by the author(s). 16. Line 131: Percentage value should be 60.00% and not 66.00%. 17. Line 154: Should be traits and not taints. 18. Line 158: There is no source for table 1. The source should be included in line 158. 19. The Rupee sign ''Rs'' should be attached to the income ranges of table 1 for us to know the currency in contention.	Noted

20. Line 161: Should be coefficient and not co-efficient
21. Line 168: Should be socio-personal traits and not socio-personnel trails
22. Line 172: Should read S.No. and not SI.No.
23. Line 184-185: Should read awareness of the issues faced by the beneficiaries in obtaining the advantage of the program. Became and (N=300) should be discarded. The sample size was stated in the methodology. Leaving it there will amount to tautology.
24. Line 199: Should read conclusion and recommendation. The author(s) gave a recommendation.
25. References are not in the format requested by Science Domain International. Author(s) should effect corrections with emphasis on the position of dates of publication and initials of author(s)
26. The paper should be organised in sections for proper arrangement and numbered accordingly. Authors may consider this:
    1. Introduction
    2. Literature Review
    2.1 Overview of MGNREGA
    2.2 Implementation of MGNREGA
    2.3 MGNREGA and Poverty Alleviation
    3. Methodology
    4.Results and Discussions
    5. Conclusion and Recommendations

    Note: Objectives and salient features of MGNREGA should be included in the overview of MGNREGA.

    Suggested Works to help Author(s) in Literature Review
    1. Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on Rural Labour Markets by Reddy et al 2014. Available at:http://works.bepress.com/aamarender_reddy/9
    2. Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (Mnrega) on Poverty Alleviation by Badodiya et al 2011.
    3. Effects of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on expenditure in rural households by Ahmad Emad, 2013.
    4. Examining the evidence on the effectiveness of India's rural employment guarantee act by Raag Bhatia et al, December 2016.
    5. MGNREGA SAMEEKSHA - An Anthology of Research Studies on the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, 2006-2012.Ministry of Rural Development Government in India. Compiled by Neelakshi Mann and Varad Pande. It was edited by Mihir Shah

    Note: All these works are available online.

27. Therefore, the author(s) may consider these compulsory adjustments as these will enhance the quality and originality of the work.

Plagiarism was approximately 5.11% in 5 sources
Sources found:
All Sources
3.33% www.ijmra.us
2.59% www.meritnation.com
1.25% www.and.nic.in
1.25% www.isleijle.org
0.44% www.nrega.net

	Originality/Novelty of the Work: There is fundamental evidence of originality in the study; therefore, its authenticity, credibility and novelty are not in doubt	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Results and discussions should be organized in a manner that allows the data presentation to appear first before discussion. For instance, the discussion of table 1 should appear under table 1. This ensures proper organization. For example, reference was made to table 3 in line 159 but the table was situated in line 171 while table 2 was situated in line 168. The current format is applicable when all tables are organized in the appendix.	
Optional/General comments	Nil.	