

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_103996
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the role of libraries in promoting child mental health in Bangladesh
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The topic is very interesting. The role of libraries to promote mental health of children is a current issue in many Western countries. So, the topic is very apt and interesting to many readers.</p> <p>2. Since the research interviews only 3 people, probably a phrase can be added in the title 'a case of three libraries in Bangladesh'</p> <p>3. Partially yes.</p> <p>4. The study is more focused on mental health rather than the library.</p> <p>5. The paper needs some more focus and clarity.</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs English correction. This can be done by giving to some English professors or teachers.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are lots of comments to be conveyed to the author/s.</p> <p>1. Text analysis technique is done on interview data. Mainly content analysis or thematic analysis is used for qualitative data. So, the researcher has to justify why text analysis technique is used, or else change it to content or thematic analysis.</p> <p>2. The main role of library is to provide reading materials. The study does not mention 'how many books or reading materials are available on mental health in the libraries being studied, and how many help children in their mental health in the library etc.'...</p> <p>3. Review of literature talks more about mental health, but less about library. it is mentioned in the review that the library should organise read aloud program etc... In libraries, public silently read books. There should be specific place in the library for children to socialise. This is not mentioned or discussed.</p> <p>4. Age. When the study repeatedly says about mental health and library, children (the study should define clearly, what it means by child or children) Is it from 1 to puberty? Or the study considers school going children etc, is a must for the study.</p> <p>5. Too many numbering is seen in the paper format. For example, 2. Literature review. This goes to 2.7.6.8. This kind if numbering is not recommend in ta research paper.</p> <p>6. Methodology needs refinement. It should sound like research paper methodology.</p> <p>7. Findings and discussion do not synchronize; also, recommendations do not come from study results.</p> <p>8. Though the topic is very interesting, many details a psychologist or mental health professional expects in the research paper is missing here and there.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. T. Janetius
Department, University & Country	India