Review of: "The Complexity of Leaving No One Behind: Unmasking and Emphasizing Multiple and Intersectional Marginalisation in India"

Andrés Señoret[1]

1 Pontifical Catholic University of Chile

While the article provides a valuable contribution to poverty studies in India, there is an important mismatch between the purposes of the article and its ambitions and the data presented. It is announced that the causes of multidimensional poverty in India and its intersectional characteristics will be explored in greater depth, understanding how different deprivations can accumulate and generate new poverty conditions. The conclusions section discusses some hypotheses regarding the above. However, the results section shows mostly the georeferencing of the poorest districts, being more descriptive than explanatory.

I do not know if the georeferencing of the poorest districts is sufficient to investigate the causes of poverty. The mere geographic description and location of the districts (which for someone unfamiliar with India can be a bit confusing), could be accompanied by a set of quantified independent variables (access to infrastructure, access to health care, access to education, etc.).

For example this is seen in the statements beginning in the section entitled "Revisiting intersecting margins" which do not seem to be supported by the data shown in the article, why is it possible to say that "The socially diverse India is increasingly becoming a socially divided society with the most marginalized facing systematic discrimination" if there is no analysis of the evolution of multidimensional poverty over time? Or why "The traditional administrative governance has proven inadequate to recognize and address their most-disadvantaged position" if the article also failed to look at the relationship between governance and poverty?

I think there are two ways to solve the above. Either the objectives and purposes of the article are adjusted at the beginning and end, announcing and explaining that we want to deliver a report on the geographic location of the districts with greater poverty, or the data are further developed, perhaps relating some structural aspects of each district (infrastructure, labor conditions, access to services, etc.) with their poverty levels, seeking to understand what characteristics (social, geographic, political) are those that could be explaining a greater or lesser multidimensional poverty.