

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-58610**

Title: Analyzing Womens Labor Force Participation in Karnataka Using the SHRUG Dataset.

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's ID: JPR- **098**

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Decision: Accept after Major Revision

Major Comments

- Strengthen the novelty and research contribution.** The manuscript should more clearly explain how this study differs from previous research on women's labor force participation in India and Karnataka, particularly in terms of methodology, dataset utilization, and policy contribution.
- Expand the methodological justification.** While the regression analysis is presented, the authors should provide stronger justification for the selection of explanatory variables, discuss potential omitted-variable bias, and explain whether multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and other regression assumptions were tested.
- Improve the interpretation of the regression results.** The discussion mainly reports statistical significance but provides limited interpretation of the practical or economic significance of the estimated coefficients. The policy implications of the findings should be elaborated.
- Address the limitations of the dataset.** Since the analysis relies on the 2011 Census and SHRUG dataset, the manuscript should discuss how the

REVIEWER'S REPORT

age of the data may affect the relevance of the findings and whether more recent datasets or validation could strengthen the conclusions.

5. **Enhance the policy discussion.** The recommendations should be more directly linked to the empirical findings and include specific, evidence-based strategies for improving women's labor force participation in Karnataka.
6. **Expand the discussion of limitations and future work.** The manuscript should explicitly discuss limitations related to data availability, unobserved socioeconomic factors, and model specification, while suggesting directions for future research.

Minor Comments

1. The abstract should briefly include the key statistical findings and the main policy implication to better highlight the study's contribution.
2. The literature review should incorporate more recent studies (2023–2026) and provide a clearer comparison with existing research.
3. Define all variables, abbreviations, and data sources clearly when they first appear in the manuscript.
4. Improve the quality and readability of tables and figures by ensuring consistent formatting, labels, and captions.
5. Report additional regression diagnostics (e.g., multicollinearity measures, goodness-of-fit statistics, and residual analysis) to improve transparency.
6. Several paragraphs in the Results and Discussion section are lengthy and could be divided into shorter paragraphs to improve readability.
7. Ensure that all references follow the journal's citation style consistently and verify that recent relevant literature has been included.
8. The conclusion should more clearly distinguish between the study's key findings, policy implications, and future research directions.