

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_108423</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalence and pattern of traditional bullying, amongst secondary school students in Yenagoa, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

### PART 1: Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research study was conducted in a scientific manner and it has been well represented in the manuscript. The language and narrative is clear and fluent, and all bases have been covered for expertly. Overall, it is a good article and it has scope for publication.</li> <li>• To understand the results deeper, further parametric statistical tests are suggested to explore other aspects. For now, most of the variables have been considered at ordinal/nominal level, and while the statistical tests chosen have been represented well, there is more scope to consider other statistical tests. For example, it could be interesting to examine the relationship between different kinds of bullying through correlation tests, to see if various forms of bullying occur together. Right now, the focus has been more on the gender differences only. Regardless, since the main objective was to assess only the prevalence of bullying, the results are adequate.</li> <li>• Comments based on points on the left</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is very important for the scientific community as it deals with a pervasive social problem (bullying) that affects mostly young people in almost all societies. With huge transformation in nature of bullying in the internet age, it is important to study bullying further in order to counteract it</li> <li>2. The title of the manuscript is appropriate and adequate. The most important aspects of the study have been included to provide a good idea of the overall study.</li> <li>3. The abstract has been written well, and all crucial parts of the research study have been represented. The word length of the abstract is up to the discretion of the editor.</li> <li>4. The manuscript has been structured in a scientific manner, and details have been adequately given as per the headings. The nature of writing and structuring of paragraphs have been expertly done, and all ideas are represented well and back by adequate literature.</li> <li>5. The manuscript and the research study it reports is scientifically correct, and all necessary protocols have been covered.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and adequate. For some in-text citations, few details are missing. Also, for the reference list, DOI/URLs can be added for all entries. Otherwise, the referencing has been expertly done in this manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English language used in the manuscript is mostly correct and properly done. Besides few minor typos, there are no major issues in terms of English language use. Nonetheless, editing/reviewing by an English language expert could make this manuscript even better.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> <b>There were no ethical issues that were apparent.</b> All necessary protocols have been completed. Institutional review was obtained; informed consent/assent was taken, privacy/confidentiality was maintained.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Prakat Karki</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CHRIST (Deemed to be) University, India</b>