

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_124052
Title of the Manuscript:	The Evolution of Human Communication During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Challenges, Adaptations, and Future Directions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth exploration of how the COVID-19 pandemic has transformed communication practices across various sectors. The research highlights critical challenges such as technological barriers and communication fatigue while emphasizing the adaptations individuals and organizations have made. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on future communication trends, particularly its emphasis on hybrid models and the need for digital literacy. However, My opinion is the author should rewrite this article and include the following all or some tests:</p> <p>1. Chi-Square Test of Independence: This test could be used to examine relationships between categorical variables presented in the tables. For example:</p> <p>Hypothesis: There is a significant association between the type of technological barrier faced (internet connectivity, difficulty with digital platforms, technical problems) and the adoption of specific digital tools (video conferencing, messaging apps, social media).</p> <p>2. One-Sample t-test: This could be used to compare the reported percentages against an expected value or benchmark.</p> <p>Hypothesis: The percentage of participants reporting increased anxiety (47%) is significantly different from a hypothesized population value (e.g., 50% or a pre-pandemic anxiety level).</p> <p>3. Correlation Analysis: While not explicitly presented in the results, if the raw data is available, correlation analysis could be performed between various reported percentages.</p> <p>Hypothesis: There is a significant positive correlation between the percentage of participants reporting communication fatigue and those expecting continued use of video conferencing platforms.</p> <p>4. McNemar's Test: If the study collected before-and-after data on the same participants (which isn't clear from the article), this test could be used to analyze the change in a binary outcome.</p> <p>Hypothesis: There is a significant change in the proportion of participants using digital tools for communication before and after the pandemic.</p> <p>5. Binomial Test: This could be used to test whether the proportion of participants reporting a specific issue is significantly different from chance.</p> <p>Hypothesis: The proportion of participants expecting hybrid work models (74%) is significantly different from 50% (chance level).</p> <p>What I believe is- hypotheses and testing of that hypotheses will add value to the article.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "The Evolution of Human Communication During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Challenges, Adaptations, and Future Directions," is descriptive and clearly outlines the key focus areas of the study. However, it could be refined for more impact and clarity.</p> <p>An alternative title could be:</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>"Transforming Communication in the Wake of COVID-19: Overcoming Challenges and Shaping the Future".</p> <p>This version emphasizes the transformative nature of communication and aligns with the forward-looking aspects of the research.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	Yes	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	Yes	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough qualitative methodology, including the use of in-depth interviews that capture a wide range of perspectives. The thematic analysis applied to the interview data provides a clear and systematic approach to identifying patterns and trends in communication practices during the pandemic. Additionally, the study draws on well-established literature and previous research to support its findings, ensuring that the conclusions are grounded in existing scientific knowledge. The attention to both technological and psychological factors in communication further enhances its scientific accuracy.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	Yes	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Ramesh
Department, University & Country	Government Degree College, India