

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_119051
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL VALUES AND CULTURE ON DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN
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://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. It is important as it uphold gender inclusivity and fairness. But sources are bit outdated. Findings and conclusion are not new.</p> <p>2. The word impact seems quantitative in nature. The author may change it to make it qualitative in nature.</p> <p>3. The method in the abstract can still be explicitly and clearly discussed/stated. The proposed solution as promised in the objective is not mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>4. A method section could be provided to illuminate how sources of data were selected. Is this a review of Literature? if it is much better to indicate the studies being reviewed.</p> <p>5. This seems to be a recollection of the past pieces of evidence that manifest the inferiority and discrimination against women. To make this article more scientific, this could have been a systematic review of literature on the gender bias.</p> <p>6. The paper is not consistent with its referencing style. Moreno et al. 2005 is not found in the reference list.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>-The paper could have used recent published papers relevant to the topic. - Method should be clearly discussed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English is fine.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joemar Minoza
Department, University & Country	Cebu Technological University, Philippines