

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_88862
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of Women on VAWC (RA 9262): Basis for Information Dissemination on Women's Rights Program
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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 CHANGE SUGGESTION. KNOWLEDGE ABOUT ETHICAL-LEGAL AND SOCIO-POLITICAL ASPECTS ABOUT DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND HER CHILDREN IN RELATION TO THE INTIMATE PARTNER</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: Particularly, the authors problematized the theme well, but it is necessary that the general and specific objectives are connected with the title of the study. If they change, please add those changes.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY: The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study are not described in the method. Is the questionnaire used validated? Has permission been requested from the authors? Or was the questionnaire created by the authors? This is not clear from the text.</p> <p>Another important information is whether the work was approved by the Research Ethics Committee, as the study is related to research with human beings. What got confusing is about the type of study.</p> <p>How was the focus group technique used? How was the recruitment done? It is important to make these specifics clear in the method.</p> <p>The authors emphasize that it is a described study, however it used the focus group, being a qualitative research method that gathers participants in an interview. The authors used statistical data. I would like you to specify and make it clear to the reader.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: The description of the results and discussion were clear, but the way the results were described using the focus group technique was confusing. Review this!!!</p> <p>CONCLUSION: In conclusion, it managed to achieve and respond to all the objectives proposed by the authors, however, I felt the need to present the main limitations of the study (review if this information should be included in the conclusion or at the end of the discussion). I also missed bringing new suggestions for future work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>CONSET: is this a case report? Please review this information.</p> <p>APPENDIX: Were they created by the authors? If yes, it is important to make it clear in the method and also if it passed to the validation process.</p>	
Optional/General comments	REVIEW STUDY FORMATTING: spacing, fonts, paragraph configuration, among others.	

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:	Jhuliano Silva Ramos de Souza
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Alfnas, Brazil