

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_120564
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Perception of Radio Programmes on Parental Sexual Abuse on Children: A Study of Residents of Owerri Metropolis
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>From Reviewer: I personally thank the author of this research for your contribution to this neglected area in social science. My style of reviewing might appear harsh or overly critical. I want you to know that despite how critical the comments are, I wish you the best.</p> <p>1. [In Abstract] The sentence “It was recommended that producers of programmes that focus on child abuse should enrich their content and schedule the programme at the appropriate time so as to attract a good number of listeners” could be rephrased for clarity. For example, consider using “the result suggest that” instead of “it was recommended” to prevent misinterpretation by readers that the statement was made by the author’s bias instead of the result.</p> <p>2. [In Abstract] The sentence “Efforts should be made by radio stations and programme producers to make their programmes effective in curtailing the issue of child abuse” could also be rephrased to express neutrality of the researcher. The suggestion by the author that there is any “curtailing” might allow readers to misinterpret the statement as an accusation instead of a suggestion.</p> <p>3. [In Introduction] The statement “the "nature of child exposure to modernity and pornographies and parents attitude towards sex: have led to increase in cases parental sexual abuse of children.” is a bit too ambiguous when reading within the paragraph among other citations. Perhaps the author could add some clarification afterward. Another option is to cut out the statement out altogether. If the author wish to make a point about the relationship between exposure to modernity and CSA, perhaps narrow it down to something less ambiguous than “modernity”, which is too broad of a term.</p> <p>4. [In Introduction] The statement “With the increase of sexual abuse against children in Nigeria in recent years, one then questions what the mass media (radio) have done to curtail these menaces through their programmes. ” shows strong emotion of the author toward sex crime. I understand that the topic is anger inducing for the author, but in research, the author did a good job of summarizing the damage of CSA already in the previous paragraph. From what I’ve read, the author could cut this statement out entirely or replace the word “menaces” with something else less strong.</p> <p>The statement “what the mass media have done to curtail these menaces” is a bit problematic since the author has no evidence of the “curtail” being intentional, and it could mislead readers into misunderstanding the author, since the statement could be interpreted as the author accusing someone falsely without evidence. I’d recommend cutting or rewriting this part.</p> <p>5. [In Introduction] The sentence “It is very much disturbing to see the high level of parental sexual abuse on their children in our contemporary society.” has similar comment to item number 4. It is widely known that CSA invokes strong emotional response in general. The author does not need to include their personal feelings in the paper. They already did a good job of educating readers about the danger of it, and the damage it could have done to a child. I’d recommend cutting the statement out to avoid the paragraph being excessive.</p> <p>6. [In Population of the Study] The author does not need to include the definition of the word “population”, so the definition could be deleted.</p> <p>7. [In Sample Size] Delete the sentence “It will be difficult to study the entire population of Owerri metropolis” entirely. Also delete the phrase “As a result” in the next sentence. The author could start the section with “A sample size was selected...” and so on.</p> <p>8. [In Sample Size] The author might consider changing number in the sample size section from 400 people to 362 people since according to Table 1 in page 14, only 362 valid copies were used. (this one is optional).</p>	

Review Form 3

9. [In Table 5: p.15-16] Correct the phrase “how not a touch a little child”. I’d recommend changing from “a little child” to “a child” as well in all places the phrase appear within the section.

10. [In Discussion of Findings] This one is also optional. If it is me (the reviewer), I might write this section in a more neutral tone. But consider how the author might need to express a sense of urgency and to promote awareness. I think the tone here is appropriate. This paper could be one of the “public outcry” the author mentioned previously. I hope this would raise awareness in Nigeria.

11. [In Discussion of Findings] The sentence “The truth is, with the level of prominence given to this issue of parental child abuse, it will be difficult to have a positive influence.” might be the author’s personal opinion. It might be considered as a statement in which the author was over- claiming. Consider backing the claim with evidence, or removing it.

12. [In Discussing of Findings] The sentence “This could be one of the reasons why the issue is still prevalent in our society today.” might be a speculation. I’d recommend the author to remove this as well if there is no clear evidence to back the claim. However, if the author wish to express personal opinion, consider adding “in researcher’s opinion, ...” before making these claims. This solution applies to item number 11. as well.

13. [In Discussing of Findings] The sentence “From the theoretical angle, if the media is not effectively doing their job regarding child abuse, it will be difficult to influence people about what to think about.” could be removed with similar reasons to item number 11 and item number 12.

14. [In Conclusion] Consider replace the term “menace” with something else less strong. I think strong language could distract readers.

15. [In Conclusion] The statement “The issue of parental sexual abuse is a concern that should bother everyone in society because the future of any country lies with children” might be read as the author’s personal wish rather than a well thoughtout conclusion of a research. If the author wish to include this statement, consider clarifying to readers that it is a personal opinion.

16. [In Conclusion] The statement “because any traumatized child will definitely display some unacceptable behaviour in society.” is both over-claiming and is in conflict with a huge amount of research in psychotherapy. It is true that CSA victims could develop trauma and psychological disorders in the future, but only the minority do. I understand the point that the author is trying to convey though, I just wish that the author adjust the statement to be more congruent with empirical evidence. Consider rewriting the statement to be congruent to any empirical evidence of the author’s choice without over-claiming or over-simplifying.

17. Words such as “curtailing”, “ignorant” and “menace” could be either removed or replaced. The author might feel the need to use strong language to communicate the situation in Nigeria, but readers of international journals have similar moral judgment on the subject of CSA, meaning that it is internationally recognized as a crime. I think strong language here might distract readers rather than educating them about what the author is trying to communicate. For example, a researcher who interviews sex criminals does not need to include their personal feelings in their work.

Closing remark: It is enlightening for me to learn about the situation in Nigeria through the reading of this paper. I wish that your work succeeds in raising awareness about the danger of CSA. Thanks.

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kawin Kornthong
Department, University & Country	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand