

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_99648
Title of the Manuscript:	PAWSITIVE CONNECTION: WIDOWERS' LIFE EXPERIENCES ON THERAPEUTIC VALUE OF OWNING DOMESTIC PETS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This article will provide good contributions and recommendations for those who wish to research in the same field</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references used are sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of English is in accordance with scientific language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In general, this manuscript has a logical flow in accordance with the systematics of good scientific writing, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Method provides sufficient detail for the general reader - The papers are easy to follow and have a logical flow - Have used sufficient literature on the subject 	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Mustanir
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia