

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_105285
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNICATION GAP IN IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT BY FATHERS ON THEIR ADOLESCENT SONS
Type of the 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>)

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>The definition of fatherless in the article can be misleading. Is this a cultural definition or from the dictionary? The abstract objectives seem to make claims that need to be substantiated. In today's world, mothers also work outside the home and therefore the sweeping statement that "fathers focus more on their roles outside the home" is not accurate. Is this for families where mothers do not work outside the home?</p> <p>More descriptions of participants and their backgrounds is important. Out of the 7 dyads, how many had mothers working outside the home? Were all fathers in managerial positions?</p> <p>What were the ethical consideration given that minors were interviewed? How was consent given by the participants? How were study sites chosen, and why just one pair in each city? What was the main focus of the interview, were some interviewed separately or together with their dads?</p> <p>Under findings and discussion, it is difficult for readers to understand whether the claims are based on evidence from interviews or opinions of the authors or information from literature. As a result, the conclusions do not seem to come from the data presented.</p> <p>The data presented does not seem to support claims made in this article... also the communication gap is not very explicit.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Not clear how the data was analysed to support claims made in the article</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Viola Manokore
Department, University & Country	Nor Quest College, Canada