

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_122142</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Navigating the Obstacles to Reporting and Prosecuting Sexual Harassers Within High-Pressured Environments</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The paper is crucial as it discusses sexual harassment within the entertainment industry, emphasizing power dynamics, economic repercussions, and digital harassment. I appreciate the research as it highlights the challenges victims face in reporting instances, underscoring the need for comprehensive support systems, strong legal frameworks, and industry standards to effectively address and prevent harassment.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The word 'entertainment' is missing in the title, which is a research filed in this case. So it could be "Navigating the Shadows: Understanding and Addressing Sexual Harassment Challenges in the Entertainment Industry"	
<b>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.</b>	Full form of EEOC and two to three line on Conceptual frame work and research gap are missing. Other than that it is comprehensive.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Prior to delving into the research methodology, it is essential to establish a sub-heading for the conceptual framework	
<b>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.</b>	The researcher employed a mixed-method approach and appropriately planned the research methodology, rendering it scientifically valid. Furthermore, a comprehensive literature review enhances its scientific rigor, while the abundance of data further solidifies its robustness.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<a href="https://www.epw.in/tags/sexual-harassment">https://www.epw.in/tags/sexual-harassment</a> The researcher may refer. The Indian #me too debate may also be referred.	
Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aparna Dixit</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sarojini Naidu Centre for Women's Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, India</b>