

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJARR_118059
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of NTA's Drama Programmes on child Abuse Among Residents of Abuja Municipal Area Council FCT Nigeria.
Type of the Article	

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. Yes and thanks for authors to paying attention to this important subject.</p> <p>2. Not completely. a) What is NTA stand for? b) What is FCT stand for? - Please use complete terms in title instead of abbreviations.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract is not comprehensive and informative. Abstract mainly includes background and result/discussion. Where is method? Please add some details about method. Abstract also doesn't contain aim of study. Please complete the abstract.</p> <p>4. No. Especially in the introduction section needs to be restructured.</p> <p>5. Considering that very few information has provided about method section, I don't have any idea regarding this question.</p> <p>6. No, references need to be updated. Additionally, reference style is wrong. PLEASE follow the journal's reference style (Vancouver).</p> <p>Other comments for improving your manuscript: INTRODUCTION: Introduction needs to be restructured. It does not have sensible structure now.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY: Why methodology section is so short? Add detailed information about study design, study context, place and time of study. How did you calculate sample size? Add formula. Please add information about participants, eligibility criteria, sampling method, Which instruments did you use in the study? Please add above information. You can use consort or casp checklist to complete method section. Its current version is not acceptable.</p> <p>RESULTS & DISCUSSION: Please mention the participants' characteristics at the beginning of results. Starting results with table is not suitable. You mainly mention finding in this section. Where is discussion????? You can follow above mentioned checklists to complete your manuscripts different sections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript need major revision. Its current version is not suitable for publication.</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> Did you receive ethical approval? If yes, please add the code (ethical code) to the method section.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sepideh Harzand-Jadidi
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran