

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_103078</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>I CANCERVIVE: EXPLORING THE MODERN TRAVAILS OF CANCER-STRICKEN ADOLESCENTS IN THE PANDEMIC NEW NORMAL</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Dear respected editor, the idea is very good but some points need to be clarified.</p> <p>1. To make a difference, Initiatives in the manuscript are required.</p> <p>2. The title could be better.</p> <p>3. No, it is not. The abstract should be rewritten and the overall objective of the manuscript should be introduced.</p> <p>4. Sections and subsections in the text are not numbered correctly.</p> <p>5. The study is carried out on a number of participants (4). In order to be revealed, the study should be carried out on a larger number of participants (10-15)</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent. Citations in the text do not comply with the requirements of the magazine's editorial guidelines. The manuscript is more like a descriptive essay or a book chapter. A lot of resources have been cited but evidence and information are described only.</p> <p>Authors can better follow the basics of essay writing; have a central point in each paragraph, argue it with evidence, then finally synthesize and summarize to bring all the points together to the main point.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The entire article should be checked for minor grammatical errors, punctuation, etc.;</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>For quick comprehension, increasing visual appeal, and improving paper quality, it is suggested adding schematics or tables.</p> <p>Suggest to the author to report the meaning of the abbreviations</p> <p><b>I recommend publishing it after reviewing the manuscript.</b></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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zagrai Gavrilă</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Saint Sylvester Secondary School, Romania</b>