

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_112810
Title of the Manuscript:	How does Socio-economic status impact on Domestic Violence against Women? Evidence from Eastern India
Type of the Article	Original research

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.If the suggested changes as indicated in my narrative above and as indicated in my comments and track changes in the manuscript are addressed, the manuscript would be strengthened substantially, improve in rigor and would be publishable. The study addresses a major concern (domestic violence against women). The title is applicable, but: in the original title, the word 'on' should be removed (and if the author prefers to keep the original title) and thus read as: How does Socioeconomic status impact Domestic Violence against Women? Evidence from Eastern India.. I suggest that the title be amended to (as it is more brief): <i>The impact of socioeconomic status domestic violence against women in Eastern India</i></p> <p>3. <i>The abstract needs to be improved – the purpose of the study, research design, data collection(including instruments and times) and analysis, reliability and validity need to be included, the overall results need to be indicated, recommendations and also the contribution of the study.</i></p> <p>4. I suggest the one subheading in the introduction should be removed, change the methods section to Research design and methodology and include underneath it subheadings : Study population and sampling, Data collection and instruments, data analysis, reliability and trustworthiness. Ethical considerations before presenting the Results and Discussion Section. Also include a main heading before the conclusion of the Limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.</p> <p>5. The manuscript needs to be amended as suggested in my review and the author is also advised to double check all statistics in tables and text and if these concur in addition to implementing the feedback in my narrative, here and in the abstract to ensure the manuscript is scientifically correct. The manuscript should be revised in accordance with the review prior to publication. I provided intensive and constructive feedback here and in the manuscript to assist the author.]</p> <p>6.As indicated in my narrative above and comments in the manuscript, more text references need to be included to substantiate claims.The manuscript would also benefit from more recent sources and text references as mentioned, particularly in the literature review section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Several language mistakes were observed and corrected with track changes in the manuscript. The latter may be due to the fact that English is not the first language of the author – the author is advised to use grammarly and a language editor to proofread the manuscript before final submission. Also, the word 'sex' of children should rather be changed to 'gender ' of children (also alluded to in my comments and track changes in the manuscript).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Refer to my general and more detailed comments in the narrative and in the attached manuscript. The author needs to address the points raised in the narrative, on this review report, and on the manuscript to strengthen the manuscript and ensure scientific rigor, and to warrant publication, I wish the author well in these endeavors</p> <p>Please see the attached manuscript for more detailed comments and track changes to assist the author</p> <p>Here are my general comments:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Title: In the original title, the word 'on' should be removed (and if the author prefers to keep the original title) and thus read as: How does Socioeconomic status impact Domestic Violence against Women? Evidence from Eastern India.. I suggest that the title be amended to (as it is more brief): <i>The impact of socioeconomic status domestic violence against women in Eastern India</i></p> <p>Abstract : The abstract must include the study's aim or purpose in the second sentence of the abstract (the study's aim is not mentioned in the abstract) The methodology is not clear as the author did not indicate in the abstract whether a quantitative, or mixed methods study was utilised. In the results section, the author only reported the quantitative findings of the two surveys. However, the author indicated in the manuscript that a mixed methods study was used with interviews, but no further information on the interviews was provided in the manuscript. The author may only report the quantitative findings but must correct this throughout the manuscript to exclude the terms 'mixed methods ' and 'interviews'. If a quantitative study was used, this should be indicated throughout the manuscript and also in the abstract; for example, Quantitative research was used to collect data through quantitative survey/s (mention the two surveys) during the two time frames when the surveys were conducted and with whom and where. It is important to mention how data was collected, analysed and how reliability and validity of the findings were ensured (only briefly mentioned in the abstract with more detail in the methods section of the manuscript). The overall results should be mentioned in the abstract and a recommendation for further research. I suggest the author also indicate the contribution of the study in the abstract and in the manuscript under the literature review for rigor. Keywords : The keywords are applicable and sufficient but the author may add the country where the survey was conducted and the type of research (quantitative OR survey)</p> <p>Introduction : The literature review lacks text references to substantiate claims and to strengthen the manuscript- also see my comments in text where text references are needed. The literature review will also benefit from an improved discussion on previous research to indicate the gap in the literature that the author will address in this research. The literature review could also include more recent sources to strengthen it. I suggest that the author remove the one subheading under the literature review (rather use more than one subheading or remove one subheading).</p> <p>Problem statement : The problem statement could be strengthened to include the detrimental effect of domestic (both physical and psychological) on women. The author mentioned the harmful effects later in the manuscript but could elaborate on it here- the problem that this research would investigate and motivation for the research should come to the fore in the problem statement section. The problem statement should culminate in the purpose statement – the author should include the purpose statement at the end of the problem statement, for example : The study aimed to.... Or The purpose of this study was.....</p> <p>Research question/s and hypothesis : The author should include a research question or questions, following the problem and purpose statement that align/s with the hypotheses.</p> <p>Research design and methodology : The research design and methodology needs attention and should be discussed in more detail. Information like the type of research design (quantitative or mixed methods) should be included and defined (also see my note in the abstract on the research design – that the author must ensure what type of research design was used, as use it consistently (only quantitative results of two</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>surveys were reported) but the author indicated mixed methods reseach and interviews. The author may use only quantiative surveys, but should remove all mention of mixed methods and interviews. Please define/describe the research design used and provide recent research text references.</p> <p>The author did not describe the study population – please do so and the number of respondents in the study population for both surveys as well as the sampling methods of both surveys (if mixed methods were used – also the qualitative sampling method, type of interviews, sample inclusion and exclusion criteria, questions for the interviews, and whether the interviews individual or focus groups.</p> <p>The quantitative instruments (scales /questionnaires) for the two surveys need to be discussed in brief – for example, the name of the two survey instuments were mentioned but also indicate the sections in each scale, for example Section A consisted of the biographical information, Section B consisted of etc. Also indicate the number of respondents in each sample, how access to the study population were obtained and ethics, how data was analysed (mention statistical programmes and all statistical tests) and how reliability and validity were determined. Please provide information on ethical considerations followed during the research.</p> <p>I suggest the author change the ‘methods’ heading to Research design and methods and discuss the above (in previous paragraphs under research design and methodology in my narrative) under the subheadings : Study population and sampling, Data collection and instruments, Data analysis, Reliability and trustworthiness. Ethical considerations.</p> <p><u>Results and discussion sections</u></p> <p>It is not always clear in this section if the author refers to the study’s results or the results of other authors – and which results are discussed in tables – indicate whether the results are from the surveys and which sections. The latter can be done by pertinently stating that In this section, the result ensuring from the will be presented and discussed... (see more detailed comments in the attached manuscript). The author must also double- check all the statistics in tables and in the text for accuracy and if the statistics in tables concur with the statistics in the text. A figure was included in the results, but it is not clear whether this figure relates to the study or another study – this needs to be clarified and could be addressed by indicating pertinently which results will be discussed and presented.</p> <p><u>Limitations and further research</u></p> <p>The above is absent in the manuscript and the author need to briefly include the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research (before the final conclusion).</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>Also reitirate the contribution of the study</p> <p><u>Text references, technical and language</u></p> <p>As already stated and as indicated in comments in the manuscript, more text references need to be included to substantiate claims. The manuscript would also benefit from more recent sources and text references as mentioned in the literature review section. Several language mistakes were observed and corrected with track changes in the manuscript. The latter may be due to the fact that English is not the first language of the author – the author is advised to use grammarly and a language editor to proofread the manuscript before final submission. Also the word ‘sex’ of children, should rather be changed to ‘gender’of children (also alluded to in my comments and track changes in the manuscript).</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

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:	Helen Meyer
Department, University & Country	North- West University, South Africa