

Review of: "Expectation of Life at Birth by Sex and Area of Residence in India and Bigger States/UT's (2013-2017): A Review"

Opeoluwa Oyedele

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The purpose of this review was to provide a comprehensive analysis of the expectation of life at birth in India and its larger states and union territories (UTs), with a specific focus on rural and urban disparities. Below are some comments and concerns for consideration in revising this work:

Introduction:

1. For a review article, the introduction section does not give a proper well-deserved introduction of the study, neither does it give a befitting background of the study as well as highlight the research problem(s) intended to be addressed on the expectation of life at birth in India and its larger states and union territories (UTs).

Methodology:

2. The methodology section only gives a very brief, yet uninformative, information about the data used. However, what about the methodological techniques used to conduct the "comprehensive analysis of the expectation of life at birth in India and its larger states and union territories (UTs), with a specific focus on rural and urban disparities" as mentioned in the first sentence of the abstract? In addition, how were the expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence values computed? What type of data analysis technique(s) was/were used? All these key information are missing under the methodology section which is not acceptable for a review study.

Results:

3. The expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence table provided should be properly typed-out and not a snapshot taken from a secondary sourced report. Also, the name of the source of this table was missing, as it is clearly shows that it was a snapshot from another person's manuscript/report which raises concerns of plagiarism.

4. Where do the last sentence on pg. 3 fits-in in this study? What is "this" that the minister stated in a written reply in the Lok Sabha here today?

Findings:

5. On finding #1: a graphical display of the trend in life expectancy for both males and females would have been appreciated to further highlight the author's observations in their interpretations.

6. On finding #2: It would have been more appreciative if the author had indicated either in the expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence table or mentioned in the statement which states were larger states and which ones were UTs, unless if all the states appearing in this table were actually all UTs?

7. Still on finding #2: "Several factors contribute to Kerala's high ELB, including a strong focus on healthcare infrastructure, education, and social development. On the other end of the spectrum" are these statements coming from scientific empirical studies or just from the author's point of view?

8. Where is the "Comprehensive Analysis" done on the expectation of life at birth in India and its larger states and union territories (UTs), with a specific focus on rural and urban disparities as mentioned in the first sentence of the abstract?, besides the descriptive table on expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence snapshot provided?

9. What were the actual/recorded/estimated population sizes of these states listed in the expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence table for 2013-2017? This information supposed to have been provided in a separate table, prior to showing the expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence table. This would have further facilitated a better understanding of the expectation of life at birth by sex and area of residence table provided as well as the author's findings highlighted in this paper.

10. What were the strengths & weakness of this review study, especially when we are in 2023 and the review study is based on 2013-2017 data?

References:

11. Where were all the citations listed under the References section cited within the study? Also, looking through these listed references, one can clearly see that they are not related at all to the title of this review study neither do they have anything in common with the area of study of this review paper.

This review study still needs to undergo thorough renovations as it fails to meet the minimum standard of a scientific review, especially around the scientific writing style of any article for publication, if the author intends to actually turn this review study into a publishable article. Thus, the author needs to put more focus on the above so that the article comes out appropriately.