

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_101414
Title of the Manuscript:	Gendered practice of Naga Customary laws: A Critical Analysis
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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript presents the practice of the customary law of a society that will be of an interesting reading in the area of sociology and ethnography</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, just need to combine the two paragraphs.</p> <p>Yes, subsections are appropriate. The paragraphing may need rearrangement</p> <p>This is a literature review that may contain bias but the writing flows well and easy to read</p> <p>Yes the manuscript is supported by adequate references</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The language is scientifically and academically appropriate. A few inaccuracies need revision.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of language</li> <li>2. Paragraphing</li> <li>3. Subsection of conclusion</li> </ol>	

### 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:	<b>Luh Putu Artini</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia</b>