

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_98096
Title of the Manuscript:	Mental Health Effects of COVID 19 Pandemic on Learners in Primary and Secondary Schools in Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> 		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>I thank firstly the editor for the possibility of reading this research and secondly the authors for the research carried out.</p> <p>The sample includes 2685 students from 30 different schools in 5 counties, whose ages range from 6 to 18 years old. now psychology shows different stages of development according to age. The results should be segmented at least by age, but it is not being considered that the effects of the isolation imposed by covid do not vary with age. Any claim must be documented, by theory and by results observed in the field. On the other hand, schools are of three different types and the conclusion should also have been segmented by age in different counties for the analysis of the effects of covid on mental health.</p> <p>The scales used in anxiety with only three categories make the statistical treatment difficult, because in fact the answers are a continuum, without going from never felt, to felt sometimes or to always felt.</p> <p>The authors based on figure 1 draw the conclusion about what the results show, but they should have documented this using static tests, in order to know if they are statistically significant or not. The results in Table 1 could be improved by using the Chi-Square test, but using age in age groups as a control variable. In section 3.1.2 the authors analyze the results according to gender. However, we do not have a description by schools and by counties of how this partition is made. What theory justifies analysis according to gender?</p> <p>Most of the statistical analysis is done only using absolute and relative frequencies, ie using descriptive statistics only. To what extent can these results be generalized?</p> <p>Thus, the statistical analysis could be improved throughout the research.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Helena de Aguiar Pereira e Pestana
Department, University & Country	ISCTE-IUL, Lisbon University, Portugal