

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_83724
Title of the Manuscript:	Parenting Styles of Adolescents' Parents in Kandy District, Sri Lanka: An Exploratory Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.6](#)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title</p> <p>Unclear, not indicate or reflect the target population sampled. Is it mean healthy adolescent or have specific problem?. In addition, the design not consistent what already mentioned in the design section</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract clearly and concisely summarizes the main feature of the study (objectives, design, setting, result and conclusion), but did not mention the sample size. No information is presented regarding the implication.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p><i>Problem statement</i></p> <p>The problem stated visibly, identified well, but the language is weak. The problem statement builds a cogent, persuasive argument for the study, but bonding the ideas and explanations was not in appropriate way. The focus on eleven hours of the day but without specifically determined them.</p> <p><i>Literature review</i></p> <p>Some of them seem to be old. The literature review provides a state of the art synthesis of evidence on the problem.</p> <p><i>Research question</i></p> <p>The researchers did not mention the research question.</p> <p><i>Research objective</i></p> <p>The study objectives are presented in the introduction section. Specific research objectives are outlined prior to the methods section of the article.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p><i>Research design</i></p> <p>The information about the study design is limited in detail.</p> <p><i>Study location</i></p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p><i>The setting</i> not well defined.</p> <p><i>Study participants</i></p> <p>The study population is not identify and describe.</p> <p><i>Study criterion</i></p> <p>The inclusion criteria and exclusion are not state in this study.</p> <p><i>Sample size calculation</i></p> <p>The information about the sample size estimation is somewhat limited in detail.</p> <p><i>Study procedure</i></p> <p>The presentation of information about the study procedures and measures is not adequate to understand how the data were collected and measured.</p> <p><i>Data analysis</i></p> <p>The information about statistical analysis was not adequately described clearly. It appears that this study relied upon a thematic analysis approach.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Thematic analysis approaches for results are presented in the text as appropriate. The theme appears logical, complete and categorization theme well described.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>The results discussed considering the findings from other studies.</p> <p>Limitation</p> <p>Not mention</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion based on the result. The conclusion was appropriate for the reported findings.</p> <p>References</p> <p>The references are presented and stated at the end of the study according to the Journal style. However, there are many outdated</p> <p>Writing style</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	I strongly recommended review the manuscript by a native English speaker for editing and proofreading.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haytham Mohammad Al-Oran
Department, University & Country	Mutah University, Jordan