

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_97298
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Clergymen on the Care and Stigmatization of Persons with Mental Illness in Nigeria
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)
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)	Extremely interesting work both in terms of topic and content. The problem with mentally ill people is a topic that is usually avoided, pushed under the carpet and someone else is expected to solve the problem of these people. Attention is drawn to them most often after a tragedy, for example a shooting in a shopping center, but soon everything is forgotten. This work gives a specific view of the sick, usually a priest is expected to give purposeful advice, a nice word that heals the soul and helps.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is satisfactory	
Optional/General comments	Work is absolutely fine. I usually insist on consistency in the use of the font, so the author must correct and equalize the font in the reference to the basic text. He uses New Times 12, and in the quotation Calibri 11, it is inadmissible in my opinion.	

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:	Branislav R. Tanasic
Department, University & Country	People University, Serbia