1. The actual purpose of the paper needs to be clarified: are you exploring the role of philanthropic organizations working with marginalized groups in society; or are you exploring how and why these organizations formed? You mention exploring the impact of COVID in the beginning, but there is no evidence that this was pursued – no mention in the methodology, findings or discussion.
2. The content of the paper needs to have basic terms defined to help understanding. For example:

* How and why do you distinguish between philanthropic, charitable, voluntary, and other NPO organizations?
* How do you define the neoliberal state?
* What kind of philanthropies are you examining – top-down ones, well-funded by wealthy parties targeting particular populations for help; or bottom-up ones, founded by members of the marginalized communities for self-help purposes? Or both? If bottom-up, how do these weak, marginalized parties have the ability to form a philanthropic organization?

1. What particularly distinguishes Jewish philanthropies?
2. You seem to focus on different types of philanthropic organizations (conserving, social inclusive, and hybrid) without tying them into your research questions.
3. The methodology needs more detail – why were these particular groups investigated, how were interviewees recruited, what are their demographic details, what questions were raised, if any, how long did each interview last, who were the interviewers, how was the information from the interviews organized, how were important issues identified, etc.
4. The findings section needs to be organized more systematically to reflect the issues that were raised by the three different kinds of organizations with relation to the research questions. For example, you mention mapping and interface in the research questions, but there are no findings or discussion about these issues. You mention quotations in the table, but none appear in the text.
5. There is an imbalance between the explanations, participants, and discussion of ultra-Orthodox and immigrant groups – the latter need more attention. Alternatively, focus on only the former.
6. The findings do not match the research questions, nor are they clear how they were arrived at. Perhaps some quotations from interview would help. Some research questions have no findings.
7. The discussion is not based on the findings.
8. The paper needs a conclusion.