

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	There are some major weaknesses to this study that must be addressed before there can be consideration publication. The researcher(s) did not detailed the sampling of the study, and this creates a significant problem in establishing scientificity of the findings. In addition, the researchers did not provide any Cronbach alphas for the various scale, and use of factor analysis to determine suitability and appropriateness in employing the various sub-scales. Furthermore, the researchers should be computed the scale and then used it for analyses. Those issues are fundamental and should this manuscript must be redone to address the concerns after which it should be reevaluated before publication.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paul Andrew Bourne
Department, University & Country	Northern Caribbean University, Jamaica