

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57164

Title: Employment Shock, Labour-Market Inequality, and Public Health after COVID-19: A Global Secondary Policy Analysis, 2020–2024

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Focuses on a highly relevant global public health issue
- Clear objective linking employment with health outcomes
- Uses credible data sources like ILO, WHO, and UN
- Well structured analysis with logical flow
- Good use of global indicators such as unemployment and jobs gap
- Tables and figures on pages 2 and 3 improve clarity of data presentation
- Policy interpretation table on page 7 adds practical value
- Ethical statement and data source transparency clearly mentioned

Weakness of the study

- Not an original data study, based on secondary analysis only
- Lacks detailed statistical or econometric analysis
- Mostly descriptive and interpretive in nature
- Limited critical comparison with other similar studies
- Some repetition in discussion section
- Over reliance on global aggregates without regional breakdown
- Writing is good but some sentences are lengthy

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript presents an important and timely analysis of labour market changes after COVID 19 and their implications for public health. The use of global datasets from ILO, WHO, and UN strengthens the credibility of the findings. The data presented in the table on page 2 and figures on page 3 clearly illustrate trends in unemployment, jobs gap, and gender inequality. The policy interpretation table on page 7 is particularly useful as it connects labour indicators with health relevance and policy actions. Ethical clearance is appropriately addressed, stating that no approval was required due to the use of secondary aggregated data. The writing is generally clear and professional, though some sentences are slightly long and can be simplified. The study is mainly descriptive and lacks deeper analytical or statistical evaluation, which limits its scientific depth. Some repetition is also present in the discussion. Overall, the paper is informative and relevant, but could be improved with more critical analysis and concise writing.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT