

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_95505
Title of the Manuscript:	Frequency of Scoliosis among School Going Students Carrying Heavy Bags: A Cross-Sectional Study in Lahore Pakistan
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>	Lack of novelty found in the manuscript.  1. Please reframe the keywords with much more appropriateness. 2. Introduction is not so rationale with the study. Please reframe it with much more scientific evidences. 3. The research question, why the researcher is interested for this study, is not properly visible in the introduction part. Please reframe it. 4. Please specify the research aim and objectives in a separate heading. 5. Lack of strong controlled methodological backup has been found in the manuscript. 6. Deficiency of scientific explanations under each heading is found in the manuscript and technically more detailed information should be given under each outcomes. 7. Please reframe suggestions and recommendations part in more precise in a single heading.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anup De
Department, University & Country	Visva Bharati University, India