

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_101414
Title of the Manuscript:	Gendered practice of Naga Customary laws: A Critical Analysis
Type of the Article	Review 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Partially although there are international organizations that can support women and they are not mentioned if it is a theoretical review.</p> <p>I consider as a proposal: female participation and its relation to Naga customary laws: a critical analysis</p> <p>In the abstract, the objective of the article should be placed, the problematic, the conclusion, basically, and only the context of the situation is shown, so it does not meet the necessary elements.</p> <p>No, the sequence is lost with such extensive paragraphs and it does not delve into the topic that is being analysed.</p> <p>I believe the review should be expanded and generate a discussion with the author's proposal</p> <p>There is no need to expand and it should preferably be from the last 5 years, although in this case the original documents should mainly be present so as not to fall into appointments</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>I consider reviewing some words since they do not have the correct meaning</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Danae Duana Avila
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Ciencias Económico-Administrativas, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, México