

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117662
Title of the Manuscript:	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN INDIA: A HUMAN RIGHTS PERSPECTIVE”
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This article is important to the scientific community. It makes valuable contribution to knowledge.</p> <p>The title is appropriate and suitable too.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are equally appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientific correct.</p> <p>The references are recent but they are not quite sufficient.</p> <p>Author should remove the colon after the word "abstract" and all subheadings under the abstract such as introduction, objective, method and conclusion. Where it is written "result" in the abstract, remove the colon and make result the beginning of that sentence. Keywords should also be at least five words.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality is not bad at all, except for some few areas that need to be edited. For example, contracted forms like didn't should be rewritten as did not. Moreover, women should never be written as women's in this paper. About the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the sentences should be rewritten this: Women who were living in the study area Women who were willing to participate in the study. Those women who were absent during the data collection period. Also, revisit the first sentence of the discussion subsection. Be very careful with your tenses too. If possible, let an English language expert edit the entire paper.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Ebikabowei Musah
Department, University & Country	Government Model Secondary School, Nigeria