

Review of: "Weathering changes – livelihood adaptation to weather shocks in rural India by disadvantaged social groups"

Syed Shoyeb Hossain¹

¹ Institute of Agricultural Economics and Development

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have got a request to review the paper titled "Manuscript: Weathering changes – livelihood adaptation to weather shocks in rural India by disadvantaged social groups". This paper does not properly explain the integration of findings with the model used. The result analysis section has not properly explained which is an important issue. The core point of any model is to analyze the difference between the baseline and the policy scenarios which are completely ignored in this research paper. The manuscript does not meet the necessary criteria for publication due to its incomplete structure, lack of clarity in presenting and discussing the results, and insufficient integration of relevant literature. Furthermore, this paper completely disregards research gaps identified by contrasting current and earlier studies, as well as future recommendations. As a result, this article will not provide useful information to decision-makers, academic researchers, or students. Finally, it can be concluded that this manuscript is unsuitable for publishing in this journal.

My necessary comments about the rejection of this paper are explained below:

1. The abstract does not provide sufficient context and background information on the issue of climate-related migration and its significance in India. It should briefly outline the broader context of climate change impacts on vulnerable communities and the importance of understanding adaptation strategies. The abstract does not clearly state the specific research gap that the study aims to address. The abstract briefly mentions the use of household and village level data, as well as weather data for analysis. However, it lacks specific details about the research design, data collection methods, and statistical techniques used. While the abstract mentions that major changes in dryness increase migration in India, it does not elaborate on the magnitude of the effect or any other significant findings. It should provide key quantitative results that highlight the main outcomes of the study. The abstract does not address the broader implications of the findings for policymakers or the academic community. It should briefly discuss the implications of the study's results for understanding climate-induced migration and potential policy interventions. The abstract lacks any mention of the study's limitations or potential areas of concern that may affect the generalizability of the findings. Including a brief discussion of limitations would provide readers with a more balanced view of the study's scope.
2. The introduction does not explicitly state the research objective or the main research question that the study aims to answer. While it discusses various factors related to climate change, migration, and disadvantaged social groups in India, it does not clearly outline the primary purpose of the study. The introduction should provide more context and

background information to set the stage for the study. It should explain the significance of examining climate change, migration, and their impact on disadvantaged groups in India, as well as how this study contributes to existing knowledge. The introduction lacks a clear identification of the research gap in the literature that this study seeks to address. The introduction would benefit from a more organized and logical flow. It should start with a general introduction to the topic, followed by a clear statement of the research objective, research questions, and the significance of the study.

3. The writing seems to mix different topics without clear section headings or transitions, making it challenging for readers to follow the flow of information. This writing introduces terms like "Standardized Precipitation-Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI)" without providing adequate explanation or context for readers who may not be familiar with the concept. This writing includes references to several studies but lacks proper in-text citations or a consistent citation style. This writing mentions the use of "TS4.04 data" and "IHDS survey," but it does not explain what these data sources are and where they come from.
4. Methodology section, The writing introduces regression equations without providing a clear explanation of the variables and their significance. The reader may find it challenging to understand the specific meaning of each variable. The equations are not properly formatted, which makes them harder to read and comprehend. Some variable names are unclear, such as " Δ Wetnessdj," " Δ Drynessdj," and "Zij." These variables should be defined or explained for better understanding. The writing includes technical jargon, such as "multilevel modeling" and "difference-in-difference-in-difference model," without providing sufficient context for readers unfamiliar with these methods. The regression methods and assumptions are not explained. It is essential to mention any assumptions made in the statistical analyses to ensure the validity of the results. The writing should include a clear interpretation of the results of each regression equation and the implications for the research question.
5. Result and discussion sections, The section lacks subheadings to clearly distinguish between different regression results and their interpretations. Subheadings can help organize the information and guide the reader through the analysis. The text presents regression results but fails to provide a clear explanation of the coefficients and their implications. The significance levels are mentioned, but their practical significance and interpretation are missing. The interpretation of results lacks context, such as how the findings relate to the research question and previous literature. Additional insights or comparisons with existing studies can make the results more meaningful. Terms like "3 percent point decline" or "significant positive effect" are ambiguous without specifying the baseline. The interpretation should clearly indicate the baseline and the magnitude of the change.
6. In conclusion section, The conclusion seems disorganized and lacks clear subheadings or sections. It should be organized logically and broken down into sections that address specific findings, implications, and limitations. The conclusion should provide a concise summary of the main findings and their significance. It should reiterate the results of the study, emphasizing the key outcomes related to climate change, migration, and the impact on disadvantaged social groups. The conclusion should discuss the broader implications of the findings. How do the results contribute to the existing literature on climate change, migration, and poverty alleviation? Are there policy implications or recommendations based on the findings? The conclusion should acknowledge the study's limitations, such as the limited data period and potential issues with the non-resident instrument. Suggestions for future research or ways to

address these limitations can be included. If relevant, the conclusion can include clear policy recommendations based on the findings. This would provide practical guidance on how the research can inform decision-making and interventions. The conclusion should be concise and to the point. Avoid unnecessary repetition and focus on conveying the most important insights.

Based on the review and evaluation of the manuscript, it has been determined that the writing lacks clarity, conciseness, and a well-structured conclusion. The conclusion did not effectively summarize the key findings of the research, discuss their implications, or address the limitations of the study. Additionally, the policy recommendations were not clear and lacked specificity. As a result, the manuscript does not meet the standards required for publication in its current form. In the end, academic readers, policymakers, and others will not get appropriate information about the model and analysis from this paper. This paper cannot be accepted for publication in its current form. While the paper presents an interesting concept, it lacks several crucial elements that hinder its clarity and impact.