

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_95465
Title of the Manuscript:	CAUSES OF UNPLANNED PREGNANCIES IN SECONDARY SCHOOL AND ITS IMPACT ON THE SCHOOL PERFORMANCE
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the author defines very well stakeholders and problem. The problem can be found in most of the countries in the world. This is very interesting and important topic. 2. Yes it is. 3. Yes it is. 4. Yes they are. 5. Peaty much, yes. If it is possible, author can add some statistical analyses, for the dependences of the factors that are used. In addition, there have to be some critical analyses on the work of stakeholders and NGO. 6. The references are too much. They have no place in the Results and discussion part.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. Yes it is	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	2. There can be used some charts, for visual representation of the results.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nedko Tagarev</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UNWE, Bulgaria</b>