

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_107540
Title of the Manuscript:	WOMEN STRUGGLE FOR WORKERS' RIGHTS IN RADICAL AND MODERATE FEMINIST MEDIA
Type of the Article	Research article

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript can be important for scientific community because it addresses the feminist issues highlighted in two media: Konde.co and Magdalene.co</p> <p>2. The article is suitable, but the extensive analysis is required in the Discussion/Body part of the article.</p> <p>3. The abstract is ok as it addresses everything required.</p> <p>4. The Introductory part is a bit lengthy. Generally, Introduction ought to include two paragraphs of parallel length. But, one subsection of the Discussion, that is, Semantic analysis of the two media, needs to be analysed in detail with rigorous references and citations. It is not detailed.</p> <p>5. Ok</p> <p>6. Minor errors in the references need to be edited.</p>	<p>Has been revised</p> <p>Has been revised</p> <p>Has been revised</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The researcher's language quality is good. The researcher needs to revisit the paper so as to edit the narrative for the uniformity.</p>	<p>Has been revised</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The researcher has pointed out how the digital media of Indonesia, Konde.co and Magdalene.co, have been voicing against the sexual harassment, discrimination of women in the work place and society. It is better if the researcher provided the instances/excerpts of such voices from the media to support his claim.</p>	<p>Has been revised</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	