

The paper provides regional multidimensional poverty estimates in India using the Alkire-Foster multidimensional approach. The study uses five dimensions: education, health, consumption expenditure, work and employment and household environment. The study observes a wide variation in multidimensional poverty levels across regions.

According to my opinion, the main contribution of the paper is exploring multidimensional poverty at a more disaggregated level. The other major contribution could have been the selection of indicators but I do not think they were not properly justified. The paper falls short of providing a sound analysis based on their findings. The paper still may receive a larger number of readerships if published in journals such as Economic and Political Weekly. Following are some comments that should increase the appeal and rigour of the paper.

1. Indicators require proper justification. Why a household should be considered deprived when any adult member passes away? What is the justification? What is the need for both occupation and employment dimensions? Do these two indicators have urban or rural bias? How rigorous is the consumption expenditure model compared to the National Sample Survey (NSS)? Is there any need for including consumption expenditure as a dimension while measuring multidimensional poverty or use only non-monetary indicators for measuring multidimensional poverty and treat the measure as a complementary measure to monetary poverty measures?

2. Given that the authors find the multidimensional headcount ratio to be 45.1% and incidentally, the 2014 Rangarajan Committee finds the consumption poverty estimated using 2004-05 NSS dataset to be 46.2%, it would be interesting to compare the state level estimates. For such analysis over time, please refer to Alkire and Seth (2015), who also found different pattern of poverty reduction across states.

3. Given that the IHD survey is quite smaller compared to the NFHS survey, yet the authors provide disaggregated estimates, I wonder what the sample size is for each region. It may be worthwhile to provide standard errors. Also, when the authors compare the poorest and second poorest regions, the comparisons should also be subjected to statistical inferences. The use of statistical inferences also applies to the dominance graph in Figure 1. Without standard errors, it is tough to compare whether dominance held.

4. I wonder why dominance analysis is conducted only by the headcount ratio. The dominance analysis should be conducted using M0 which is the main measure that the authors use. H and A are only partial indices.

## References

Alkire S. and S. Seth (2015), Multidimensional Poverty Reduction in India Between 1999 and 2006: Where and How?, World Development, 72, p. 93-108.

Alkire S., J. E. Foster, S. Seth, M. E. Santos, J. M. Roche, and P. Ballon (2015), Multidimensional Poverty: Measurement and Analysis, Oxford University Press: Oxford (Chapter 8). The chapter is also freely downloadable from [www.multidimensionalpoverty.org](http://www.multidimensionalpoverty.org).