

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_96441
Title of the Manuscript:	Unmasking Girls' Issues in a Weekly Boarding Day Secondary School
Type of the Article	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)
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. The manuscript is very important to the scientific community because it concerns feminism, especially female students, who need care and protection. 2. The title of the article should indicate the name of the boarding high school that the author is researching or the boarding high schools in the country where the author is researching. 3. The content of the abstract is relatively complete and comprehensive, but it is necessary to rewrite the summary in the direction of including the following items: Overview, objectives, research methods, discussion and conclusion. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically accurate 6. Some references are too long from 1927, 1982, 1996. Additional documents on women's rights and children's rights should be added.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Good quality article	

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:	MAI, Van Hung
Department, University & Country	VNU University of Education, Vietnam