



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	From Vision to Viability: Evaluating Odisha's Development Trajectory Towards 2036 and 2047
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

Follow the suggestions of the reviewers and submit a response form that outlines any changes made in the manuscript following the suggestions. Ensure that each reference is legitimate and that the DOI is valid.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

My main concern is the research design and the level of claims made from it. The paper says it uses a qualitative and descriptive-analytical research design and the stated purpose is to assess viability, coherence, and implementation readiness of the vision. For me, this part is methodologically problematic in its present form. Based on the methods described, the study mainly used content analysis of secondary data and policy documents, plus some descriptive tabulation. That approach can support a strong documentary policy analysis and it can also support a useful ex ante appraisal of policy coherence and stated priorities. But it is not enough by itself to make strong conclusions about implementation readiness in an actual empirical sense. Implementation readiness usually needs stronger evidence from implementers, institutions, budget execution, governance processes or at least expert validation. In short, the concern is not that the paper has no value but that the current design is being asked to do more than it can really support. Because of that, I strongly recommend that the authors either reframe the paper or expand the method. The easier and more realistic option is to reframe it. The paper can be presented as a documentary policy analysis, desk-based policy appraisal, or qualitative policy document analysis with descriptive content coding. If the authors want to keep the phrase implementation readiness, then the paper needs more evidence, such as interviews with policymakers or department officials, expert panel validation, process tracing, institutional capacity audits, or at least more direct implementation indicators and clear scoring rules. Right now, the paper looks like it is making implementation judgments from documents alone, and this may attract criticism from reviewers. A simple correction in the research design wording and in claim strength can already improve the paper a lot.

Related to this, the paper needs to separate what was directly observed from what was inferred. In some tables and discussions, the language sounds too final like the study has measured actual feasibility and readiness. But what the study really did, as written, was assess documents and secondary indicators. That is still valuable, but the conclusions should be stated more carefully. For example, instead of saying a sector is achievable, challenging, or high risk as if this is directly measured, the author can say the documentary and secondary evidence



suggests that a sector appears more or less feasible under current conditions. This small wording change will make the paper more defensible and still keep the same policy relevance.

The content analysis part also needs clearer operational definitions. The paper reports frequencies and percentages of major initiatives and targets. This is a good idea because it adds a descriptive layer to the qualitative reading. However, the manuscript should define what counts as one initiative and what counts as one target. It should also explain how overlapping items were coded, especially when one target can fit more than one sector. If this is not clarified, another reviewer may question the reliability and replicability of the count. If the coding was done manually by one coder, the author should say so. If there was another coder or a consistency check, that should also be stated. Even a brief note will help.

I also suggest the authors revise how the methodology is described overall. The paper currently calls itself qualitative but later uses frequency and percentage distributions to support the analysis. This is not wrong, but it should be framed properly. It may be better to say the study used qualitative document analysis complemented by descriptive content metrics. This sounds more accurate than suggesting the quantitative tabulation solved the limitations of qualitative analysis. The percentages in this paper are useful as indicators of emphasis in the vision document, but they do not by themselves demonstrate feasibility or readiness. If the author explains this clearly, the method section will become much stronger.

The policy implications section of the paper is practical and useful. The recommendations on institutional reforms, monitoring systems, and coordination mechanisms are sensible. This part should stay, in my view. I only suggest that the author frame these recommendations as evidence-informed implications from a documentary appraisal, not as validated prescriptions from implementation research.

The future research section is appropriate and can be improved by making the next step more explicit. The authors already point to further studies, which is good. I suggest adding that future work should include primary data from implementing agencies, sector experts, and local governance actors to validate the documentary inferences and assess actual implementation readiness. This will show that the authors understand the current study limits and see a clear path forward.

General Comments and Recommendations

Thank you for sharing this manuscript. I think the paper has a very relevant and timely topic and the authors clearly worked hard on organizing a difficult policy issue into a readable and structured analysis. The idea of looking at the gap between a long-term vision and actual viability is strong, and this can become a useful contribution. The paper already has a good direction, especially in the way it connects planning targets, institutional concerns, and sectoral priorities.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>1. The title is clear, academic, and accurately reflects the core focus of the paper and the abstract provides a good summary of the purpose, methodology, and findings. However, it reads as slightly too conceptual.</p> <p>2. The introduction effectively establishes the rise of long-term visioning in India's federal system and justifies the selection of Odisha. Since this is submitted to an international journal, the highly specific Indian context might alienate some readers. The author/s can add a brief paragraph in the introduction perhaps around the problem statement explicitly discussing how Odisha's structural constraints mirror challenges in other developing economies like those in Southeast Asia. This will broaden the relevance of this paper</p> <p>3. The literature review effectively identifies the gap in evaluating implementation capacity. The use of State Capacity and Institutional Theory is excellent and highly appropriate for evaluating governance constraints.</p> <p>4. The author/s state/s that an indicator-based assessment is used to evaluate the alignment between envisioned targets and existing socio-economic and institutional capacities. However, the paper never explicitly lists what these specific indicators are. The author/s must define the exact indicators used for this assessment. What specific metrics were used to measure baseline capacity? Without this, the methodology lacks reproducibility.</p> <p>5. Table 2 categorizes feasibility into Moderate, Challenging, Achievable, and High Risk. The author/s need/s to provide a rubric or operational definition for these classifications. What exact criteria shift a sector from Moderate to Challenging?</p> <p>6. The author/s include/s text placeholders for "Figure-1:" and "Figure-2:" , but the figures themselves are described as visually illustrating the data from Table 5 and Table 6.</p> <p>7. A doi is needed in each article, if applicable.</p>



General Comments and Recommendations

The paper provides a rigorous qualitative assessment of Odisha Vision 2036 & 2047. It effectively uses State Capacity and Institutional Theory to ground the analysis. However, to elevate this manuscript to the publication standards of a rigorous scientific journal, the methodology behind the "indicator-based assessment" requires significantly more transparency, and the qualitative claims in the results need stronger operational definitions.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			