

# Review of: "The Noisy Silence of villagers with Deafness of Dhadkai, Jammu, India: A Case Study"

Sharad Philip

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This reviewer congratulates the authors on a undertaking a research endeavour on such a neglected topic in such a geographically difficult and socio culturally cut off society .

The content of the manuscript conveys a good grasp of the authors on the subject at hand especially the difficulties and challenges faced with regard to the lived experiences of deaf persons including children and adolescents.

This reviewer wishes to point out that the manuscript can be improved significantly and substantially with regard to its reporting of the methods utilised in this research endeavour - for example it is unclear from the reading as to who the respondents are, how they were selected, whether their consent was obtained, whether this was a research approved by an ethics committee, what methods were used to collect the data, and so forth.

The manuscript mentions the use of thematic analysis - however there is no report or contextualisation to the respondents - one cannot report qualitative data collated across respondents removed from their backgrounds. It would be quite interesting to also note how the researchers/authors interacted with the study population considering their special communication needs.

This reviewer also insists that the authors not use derogatory terms such as deaf and dumb - it's quite saddening to note the use of terms such as disability pension/welfare - the accepted terminology is of social protections.

Authors can further improve the manuscript's readability by presenting the introduction sections altogether rather than presenting some of the details in the results section.

It would also benefit readers curiosity if authors could also state why this study site was chosen over the other 2 mentioned in the manuscript.

Furthermore, authors should report on how they arrived at the suggestions listed in the manuscript especially about where they were sourced from - whether as authors/researchers reflections or as respondents inputs. Some of the suggestions seem repetitive - being already implemented locally. If some tweaking or improvement is suggested, authors must mention whether there were specific enquiries in such regard

Additionally, some of the suggestions follow directly from the problems and challenges listed in the introduction - this

would appear counter intuitive to the need for the study or the presentation of its results.

Authors would do best to also review their manuscript contents in line with the objectives listed by them to undertake the study - this reviewer is of the opinion that the objectives as framed by the authors and the results as presented by the authors remain asynchronous - this may also be affected by the inadequate elaboration of the methodology.

Lastly , this reviewer would suggest that the authors include a detailed discussion section where their results may be compared with other studies done earlier/previously published - not necessarily regarding the same location but those reporting on the needs as challenges of a similar population.

Not everything need be fixed especially with the paternalistic 'development' lens from those outside the community - if the community has survived thus far subsists on husbandry actives and such would there be a perceived need let alone acceptance for rehabilitation programs or higher education? This is something the authors could include as a critique too within their manuscript - it definitely bothered this reviewer.

Authors may also consider other isolated communities such as the sentinelese.

This reviewer encourages the authors to bring out the excellent work and descriptions proved in the best light with due diligence to accepted research methods and results presentation guidelines. This is a very important work that highlights a community facing marginalizations on multiple fronts. Once again the reviewer congratulates on undertaking such valuable research and bringing to the fore very pertinent discussions.