

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55347

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

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision ...✓.....

Accept after major revision.....

Do not accept (Reasons below)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: **Sudhanshu Sekhar Tripathy**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewer's name.

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The manuscript addresses an important and socially relevant issue—digital exclusion in social housing—and provides a comprehensive policy-oriented discussion supported by recent reports and pilot programs. While the topic is timely and the discussion is well-informed, the paper is primarily **descriptive and policy-review based**, with limited original empirical or analytical contribution. As such, it requires **minor revisions** to improve academic rigor, clarity.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. Scope & Relevance

- The topic of digital inclusion, especially in social housing, is highly relevant to contemporary social policy, housing studies, and digital equity research.
- The scope is clearly defined and consistently maintained throughout the paper.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The manuscript aligns well with interdisciplinary research interests (housing, technology, social policy).

2. Structure & Technical Presentation

- The paper is well-structured with clear sections: introduction, drivers, consequences, policy responses, and conclusions.
- Tables are relevant and informative.
- Figures are referenced, but **visual clarity and captions should be improved**.
- Some formatting inconsistencies exist (spacing, line breaks, bullet alignment).

3. Methodological / Analytical Details

- The study does not present original empirical data or a formal research methodology.
- It relies on secondary sources, policy evaluations, and pilot program reports.
- While acceptable as a **review/policy analysis paper**, this should be more explicitly stated.
- A brief section clarifying the **methodological approach (narrative review / policy synthesis)** would strengthen transparency.

4. References & Citations

- References are recent (mostly 2020–2024) and relevant.
- Sources include reputable academic journals, government bodies, and policy organizations.
- Citation style is mostly consistent; though **minor formatting corrections** are needed.
- The balance between academic and grey literature is appropriate for the topic.

5. Language & Style

- The language is clear, readable, and accessible.
- Minor grammatical issues, spacing errors, and informal phrasing appear in a few sections.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Some sentences are overly long and could be simplified for academic clarity.

6. Key Strengths

- Timely and socially significant topic.
- Comprehensive synthesis of current policy initiatives and pilot programs.
- Clear linkage between digital exclusion and broader inequalities (health, education, employment).
- Strong conclusion with actionable policy-oriented recommendations.
- Well-supported arguments using up-to-date evidence.

7. Areas for Improvement (Minor Revision Needed)

- Explicitly clarify the **nature of the paper** (policy review / narrative synthesis).
- Write the conclusion part.
- Improve figure quality and ensure all tables and figures are clearly formatted.
- Reduce repetition in policy discussion sections.
- Strengthen academic tone by tightening long sentences.
- Address minor formatting and spacing inconsistencies throughout the manuscript.

Final Feedback to Author

This manuscript makes a valuable contribution by synthesizing recent evidence on digital exclusion in social housing and framing digital access as a rights-based housing issue. The paper is well-written, relevant, and supported by current literature, but it would benefit from minor revisions to improve presentation, methodological clarity, and academic precision. With these refinements, the manuscript would be suitable for publication.