




OPEN PEER REVIEW

# The Influence of Religious Beliefs on Political Participation

Kaushalya Korallage<sup>1\*</sup>, Muhammad Touseef<sup>2</sup>, Azeema Begam<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka<sup>2</sup> Department of Sociology, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan


\* Corresponding author email address: koralage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

Received: 2022-06-28

Revised: 2022-07-20

Accepted: 2022-07-29

Published: 2022-10-01

**EDITOR:**Nabeel Bani-Hani<sup>1</sup>


Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq

nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq

**REVIEWER 1:**Mrinalini Puranik<sup>1</sup>

National Health Mission, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India

MriPuranik@gmail.com

**REVIEWER 2:**Thanuja Kulasooriya<sup>1</sup>

Department Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ruhuna, Mapalana, Kamburupitiya, Sri Lanka

thkulasooriya@soil.ruh.ac.lk

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While the selection process and interview methodology are well-described, additional details could enhance reproducibility and clarity. Specifically, the paper could benefit from:

More comprehensive information on the interview guide, including example questions.

Further elaboration on the process of achieving theoretical saturation.

The diverse demographics are a strength of the study. However, a more detailed analysis of how these demographics (age, gender, religious affiliation) influenced participants' perspectives could provide richer insights.

More critical analysis of how this study's findings align or diverge from existing theories and research.

The limitations section is well-noted, but further reflection on how these limitations might influence the findings and interpretations could be beneficial. For example:

Some typographical errors and inconsistencies in citation formatting need correction for professional presentation.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The literature review sets a solid foundation, but deeper engagement with existing studies could strengthen the argument. This might include:

Comparing and contrasting findings with previous quantitative studies to highlight the added value of the qualitative approach.

Discussing the potential impact of social desirability bias in participants' responses.

Exploring the implications of conducting the study within a specific cultural or political context.

Enhancing the clarity of some sections with subheadings could improve the overall readability and structure.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.