

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_96034
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of students'-staff interactions on academic delinquency amongst undergraduate students in public universities in Kiambu and Nairobi Counties- Kenya.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? Yes, it is an article that contributes a topic that is not minor and that, as the text says, is a global evil academically. On the other hand, it is a tremendous contribution, by putting this issue on the table of investigations, worldwide. 2. Is the title of the article appropriate? Yes, it is very suggestive and according to the text. development of the article. 3. Is the abstract of the article complete? I think that it meets the necessary information to know what I will find in the development of the topic. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript adequate? The structure is only a suggestion, separate the paragraphs to have a leisurely reading and clearly know the various topics or subtopics covered. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Meets the parameters of a scientific manuscript. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form. Yes, just review APA standards.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Very good manuscript, with contributions to topics that are invisible in the academic world.	

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:	José Manuel Salum Tomé
Department, University & Country	Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile