

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_124832
Title of the Manuscript:	Loneliness, Depression And Life Satisfaction Among Institutionalised Single Mothers
Type of the Article	

[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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript offers significant contributions to the scientific community by shedding light on the psychological challenges faced by institutionalized single mothers, particularly in relation to loneliness, depression, anxiety, and life satisfaction. The use of validated scales like the Depression Anxiety and Tension/Stress Scale (DASS), the UCLA Loneliness Scale, and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) adds credibility to the study's findings. Its exploration of how demographic variables, such as marital status, income, and education, influence these mental health factors is especially important in shaping targeted interventions for this vulnerable population.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title directly highlights the main themes of the study—loneliness, depression, and life satisfaction—making it easy for readers to understand the central topics.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The abstract can be broken down into more distinct parts for clarity: Background/Introduction, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. This would help make it easier to follow and more in line with typical academic structures.</p> <p>The mention of a "convenience sample" and "104 institutional single mothers aged 15 to 39" can be stated more precisely to clarify the sample's representativeness.</p> <p>The abstract mentions general trends in loneliness, depression, anxiety, and stress but could benefit from more quantitative detail (e.g., percentage of participants with high levels of depression, or more explicit findings from the statistical analysis).</p> <p>While it's stated that participants responded to an open-ended question, this may confuse readers because open-ended questions are typically qualitative, while you mention percentages and frequencies, which imply quantitative data. Clarify the nature of the tools used—was there a standardized scale or questionnaire, and how were these open-ended responses analyzed quantitatively?</p> <p>While the abstract discusses moderate loneliness and dissatisfaction, more specific data or results (percentages, mean scores, or ranges) can provide a clearer sense of the findings without overwhelming the reader.</p> <p>In certain areas, the abstract could be simplified. For instance, phrases like "shed light on" and "contributing to the broader discourse" could be replaced with more direct descriptions of what was found and its relevance.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction: Ensure it covers the significance of studying this population and states the research objectives clearly.</p> <p>Methodology: Include a more detailed description of instruments and the specific statistical methods you used.</p> <p>Results: Use subsections to highlight key demographic, mental health, and life satisfaction findings clearly, possibly supplemented with tables.</p> <p>Discussion: This section should explicitly interpret findings in the context of the research questions and previous studies.</p> <p>Conclusion: Ensure it ties the findings back to practical implications.</p> <p>Your manuscript is likely structured well overall, but refining the division into subsections (especially in the results and discussion) will enhance clarity and readability.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it employs a descriptive, cross-sectional design, which is appropriate for exploring the relationships between loneliness, depression, and life satisfaction in a specific population like institutionalized single mothers. The use of a convenience sample of 104 participants provides sufficient data for preliminary analysis, and the statistical techniques applied (percentages, frequencies, and inferential methods) are suitable for describing and analyzing the collected	

Review Form 3

	<p>data. Additionally, the manuscript's focus on a vulnerable demographic group in a specific context (Karnataka State) enhances the relevance and significance of the findings, contributing valuable insights into an under-researched population. The methodology and clear presentation of results ensure the study is replicable and transparent.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>I can suggest you to cite this article in your bibliography: Aviani, S., Lastra, V., Ammendola, A., et al. (2022) Coping Strategies in Pregnant Women with High Risk Pregnancies during COVID-19 Pandemic. Clinical Case Reports International doi: 10.36129/jog.2022.S67</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas where improvement could enhance clarity, coherence, and overall readability. Here are some key points to consider:</p> <p>While the content is mostly clear, there are instances where sentence structure can be refined for smoother flow. For instance, sentences may occasionally be too long or complex, which could make them harder to follow.</p> <p>The article largely maintains an academic tone, but there might be areas where a more formal style is required. Ensuring consistency in language style and avoiding overly casual expressions will further elevate the tone.</p> <p>The use of relevant technical terms such as "depression," "life satisfaction," and "institutionalization" is appropriate. However, ensuring that all terms are clearly defined and used consistently would benefit the reader.</p> <p>Some areas could benefit from more precise language. For instance, when describing the findings (e.g., "the majority had been single for 1-2 years"), providing more specific figures would make the results clearer.</p> <p>In summary, while the language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, minor revisions for grammar, sentence structure, and formal tone would further strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Based on the review of the manuscript. This suggests major revision is necessary before the manuscript can be considered for publication.</p> <p>Strengths: The topic is relevant, addressing an important social issue related to institutionalized single mothers. The study design, methodology, and general structure are in place, and the manuscript contributes to an under-researched area.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement: There are notable issues in the clarity of language, the structure needs refining, and the abstract could be more comprehensive. The introduction and literature review lack sufficient depth, and recent references are missing. Some ethical considerations also need to be addressed.</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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandra Ammendola
Department, University & Country	University of Naples Federico II, Italy