

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58356

Title: Preliminary Findings on Socio-Economic Status, Health and Educational Status Among Rural Households in Tosekgre, West Garo Hills, Meghalaya,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision...YES.....

Do not accept (Reasons below)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Reviewer's Report

Overall Evaluation

The manuscript presents a descriptive cross-sectional survey of 72 rural households in Tosekgre village, Meghalaya, focusing on socio-economic, health, and educational characteristics. The topic is relevant to rural development and public health, particularly because village-level evidence from the Garo Hills region is limited. However, the study has several methodological and presentation weaknesses that substantially reduce its scientific rigor. While the findings are useful as baseline data, the manuscript requires significant revision before it can be considered for publication.

Strengths

1. ****Relevant Topic****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Addresses an important issue of rural socio-economic development, healthcare access, and educational status in an under-researched region of Meghalaya.

2. ****Local-Level Evidence****

* Provides village-specific primary data that may assist local government agencies and policymakers.

3. ****Clear Research Objectives****

* The objectives are simple, relevant, and consistent with the descriptive design.

4. ****Well-Organized Results****

* Data are presented systematically through tables with frequencies and percentages.

5. ****Policy Relevance****

* Findings may contribute to planning interventions related to housing, education, livelihood, and healthcare.

Weaknesses

Major Weaknesses

1. Weak Novelty

* Similar descriptive surveys have been published extensively across India.

* The manuscript does not clearly explain what makes Tosekgre village scientifically unique.

2. Small Sample Size

* Only 72 households were included.

* No scientific sample size calculation has been provided.

3. Convenience Sampling

* Convenience sampling introduces selection bias.

* Findings cannot be generalized beyond the study village.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Limited Statistical Analysis

- * Only descriptive statistics were performed.
- * No inferential statistics (Chi-square, regression, confidence intervals, or hypothesis testing).

5. Questionnaire Not Validated

- * No information regarding
 - * questionnaire development,
 - * pilot testing,
 - * reliability,
 - * validity.

6. Ethical Issues

- * Ethical approval number is missing.
- * Institutional Ethics Committee approval should be reported.
- * Written informed consent process requires more detail.

7. Discussion is Weak

- * Discussion mainly repeats results.
- * Limited comparison with national and international studies.

8. No Study Limitations

The manuscript fails to discuss:

- * small sample size,
- * convenience sampling,
- * recall bias,
- * interviewer bias,
- * limited external validity.

Minor Weaknesses

- * Numerous grammatical errors.
- * Spacing and formatting inconsistencies.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Incorrect citation style.
- * Typographical errors.
- * Some tables require improved formatting.
- * Keywords should follow journal style.

Key Points

Positive Findings

- * High home ownership.
- * High agricultural land ownership.
- * Good financial inclusion through bank accounts.
- * Government hospitals are the preferred healthcare providers.
- * Low school dropout rate.

Major Concerns

- * Low monthly income.
- * Poor housing quality.
- * Low participation in health camps.
- * Poor ventilation in many houses.
- * Limited vocational training.
- * Financial constraints causing school dropout.

Scientific Significance

Strength

The manuscript provides useful baseline socio-economic information from a rural tribal area where published data remain limited.

Limitation

The scientific contribution is primarily descriptive. Without analytical statistics, determinants of socio-economic or educational outcomes cannot be established.

Overall scientific significance is ****moderate rather than high****.

Originality

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Rating:** Moderate (approximately 6.5/10)**

Reason:

- * The geographical setting is relatively novel.
- * The study design and methodology are conventional.
- * Similar household surveys have been widely published.

Technical Quality

****Rating:** Fair**

Needs improvement in:

- * methodology
- * sampling justification
- * statistical analysis
- * ethical reporting
- * discussion
- * language editing

Clarity

****Rating:** Good**

The manuscript is generally understandable, although language editing is necessary.

Significance

****Rating:** Good**

The findings may be valuable for:

- * district administration
- * public health planning
- * rural development programmes
- * educational intervention planning

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

However, broader scientific impact is limited because of the descriptive nature of the study.

Specific Recommendations for Authors

Major Revision Required

The authors should:

1. Justify sample size scientifically.
2. Explain questionnaire validation and reliability.
3. Include Institutional Ethics Committee approval details.
4. Describe informed consent procedure.
5. Improve statistical analysis (include inferential tests where appropriate).
6. Expand discussion by comparing findings with more recent literature.
7. Add a dedicated "Limitations" section.
8. Clearly explain the novelty and contribution of the study.
9. Thoroughly edit the manuscript for English language and formatting.

Final Recommendation

****Recommendation:** **Major Revision****

Justification

Although the study addresses an important public health and rural development issue and provides useful preliminary village-level data, significant methodological shortcomings—including convenience sampling, small sample size, absence of inferential statistical analysis, inadequate methodological details, and insufficient discussion—limit its scientific quality. These deficiencies should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

****Overall Recommendation:** **Major Revision****

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer's Justification for Major Revision (Line-by-Line Issues and Reasons)

Line(s)	Section	Issue Identified	Reason for Major Revision
5–20	Abstract	Abstract lacks methodology details such as study design, sampling method, and statistical analysis.	Readers cannot assess the scientific validity without knowing how the study was conducted.
7	Abstract	Sample size (72 households) is small and not justified.	No sample size calculation or rationale is provided, limiting generalizability.
8–19	Abstract	Conclusions are broad considering the descriptive nature of the study.	The data support only descriptive observations, not broad policy recommendations.
21	Keywords	Keywords are too general and not standardized.	Include indexing terms such as "Cross-sectional survey", "Public health", "Socio-economic survey", "Meghalaya".
24–49	Introduction	Literature review is limited and lacks recent studies from 2023–2025.	More recent evidence is needed to establish the knowledge gap.
24–55	Introduction	Research gap is not explicitly stated.	The manuscript does not explain why this study is novel compared with previous surveys.
29–35	Introduction	No conceptual framework explaining relationships between socio-economic status, health, and education.	The theoretical basis of the study is weak.
56–61	Research Design	Study design is only described as "descriptive".	Cross-sectional design should be explicitly mentioned according to reporting guidelines.
62–68	Objectives	Objectives are descriptive only.	Analytical objectives or hypotheses are absent, limiting scientific contribution.
69–80	Study Area and Sampling	Convenience sampling was used.	Convenience sampling introduces selection bias and limits external validity.
76–80	Sample Size	No scientific sample size calculation.	Statistical justification is essential for research validity.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line(s)	Section	Issue Identified	Reason for Major Revision
79–85	Questionnaire	Questionnaire development and validation are not described.	Reliability (e.g., Cronbach's alpha) and validity should be reported.
83–85	Data Collection	Ethical approval number is missing.	Human subject research requires Institutional Ethics Committee approval.
83–85	Data Collection	Informed consent procedure is inadequately described.	Ethical compliance should be explained in detail.
84–85	Data Analysis	Only descriptive statistics are used.	Inferential statistics (Chi-square, logistic regression, confidence intervals) would strengthen the findings.
87–149	Results	Results mainly report percentages without statistical interpretation.	Statistical significance and confidence intervals are absent.
97–149	Results	Tables are descriptive but no comparative analysis is presented.	Relationships between variables remain unexplored.
106–109	Income	Income categories are outdated and lack contextual interpretation.	Income classification should be justified with reference to current standards.
111–145	Results	Important variables such as age, occupation, education, and income are not cross-tabulated.	Associations between variables could provide more meaningful conclusions.
150–181	Discussion	Discussion largely repeats the results.	Discussion should critically interpret findings rather than restate percentages.
150–181	Discussion	Limited comparison with national and international studies.	More comprehensive literature comparison is needed.
162	Discussion	Monthly savings are discussed although corresponding data are not presented in Results.	Discussion should be based only on reported findings.
166–174	Discussion	Health findings lack detailed interpretation.	Public health implications require deeper discussion.
175–181	Discussion	Vocational training is discussed but supporting data	Unsupported discussion weakens scientific consistency.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line(s)	Section	Issue Identified	Reason for Major Revision
		are not presented in the Results section.	
182–186	Discussion	Practical policy recommendations are generic.	More specific interventions based on findings should be proposed.
187–202	Conclusion	Conclusion is broader than the study findings.	Conclusions should remain consistent with descriptive evidence.
187–202	Conclusion	Study limitations are omitted.	Limitations regarding sampling, sample size, and design should be acknowledged.
203–224	References	Limited recent references (2023–2025).	More current literature should be incorporated.
Throughout	Language	Numerous grammatical, punctuation, and spacing errors.	Professional language editing is required before publication.
Throughout	Formatting	Inconsistent table formatting, spacing, and citation style.	The manuscript should comply with journal formatting guidelines.
Throughout	Scientific Quality	No reporting guideline (e.g., STROBE) followed for observational studies.	Adherence to STROBE would improve transparency and reporting quality.

Overall Justification for Major Revision

This manuscript addresses an important public health and rural development issue by providing preliminary village-level data from an under-researched area of Meghalaya. However, several substantial methodological and reporting deficiencies prevent it from meeting the standards expected for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. These include the use of convenience sampling without justification, absence of sample size calculation, lack of questionnaire validation, omission of ethical approval details, reliance solely on descriptive statistics, limited discussion of findings in the context of current literature, absence of a limitations section, and numerous language and formatting issues. Additionally, the manuscript does not adequately establish its novelty or scientific

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

contribution beyond providing descriptive baseline data. Addressing these concerns requires substantial revisions rather than minor editorial corrections.

Final Recommendation

Decision: Major Revision