

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55347

Title: Digital Inclusion in Social Housing: Bridging the Technology 1 Gap for Low-Income Households

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision...yes.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			Y	
Techn. Quality			Y	
Clarity			Y	
Significance			y	

Reviewer Name: Dr.Shaweta sachdeva

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The paper is largely descriptive and narrative, relying heavily on secondary reports and policy documents, with no original empirical data or systematic analysis framework.
2. Although several pilots (e.g., Greater Manchester Digital Inclusion Pilot) are cited, the manuscript does not clearly explain data collection methods, sample characteristics, or evaluation criteria, limiting transparency and rigor.
3. The study is positioned as an academic paper, but the structure and tone resemble a policy briefing or advocacy report, which may not align with research journal expectations.
4. The manuscript lacks a clearly defined research methodology, including how sources were selected, reviewed, and synthesized, raising concerns about selection bias.
5. Tables and figures are informative, but their analytical contribution is limited, as they primarily summarize known issues rather than derive new insights.
6. Several claims (e.g., employment outcomes, health impacts, confidence improvement) are stated broadly, but causal relationships are not empirically demonstrated.
7. The discussion repeatedly revisits similar arguments across sections (access, affordability, skills, motivation), resulting in conceptual redundancy and reduced conciseness.
8. The paper does not sufficiently distinguish its contribution from existing digital divide and social housing literature, limiting its novelty.
9. Most references are grey literature, policy websites, and organisational reports, with comparatively fewer high-impact peer-reviewed journal articles.
10. The geographical focus is primarily UK-centric, yet the manuscript does not adequately discuss contextual limitations or transferability to other regions.
11. While a rights-based framework is proposed, it remains normative and theoretical, without implementation models, metrics, or evaluation indicators.
12. Ethical concerns such as surveillance and data misuse are mentioned but not deeply analyzed or operationalized within housing technology systems.
13. Language quality is generally readable, but there are occasional grammatical inconsistencies, long sentences, and informal phrasing that require editorial refinement.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT