

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81402
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions And Practices Of Parents Regarding Responsive Parenting For Early Child Development.
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author focused more on the introduction/background. It would be ideal to also highlight the aim/objectives of the study, methodology and results in the abstract. The statement in line 11-12 needs to be rephrased e.g. research shows that the common authoritarian parenting style has negative consequences, while the authoritative style is good for children. Please clarify line 12-13: Parents find it difficult... <p>Contents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-text referencing is inconsistent, sometimes the author indicates the footnotes, at times the names of the authors and or year. Kindly consider using consistent referencing throughout. In the abstract, the author stated that the authoritarian style is common. Kindly revise so that the statements in the abstract and line 242-243 have the same interpretation. Line 245-246 sounds like a sweeping statement. It may be interpreted that it includes everything that a child needs, but this may not be the case. Kindly consider rewording. Kindly write in full to facilitate understanding even for audience residing in other areas: ECEC in line 247. <p>There is no referencing for line 25-75. If it can be done, then it should be fine.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar and rephrasing of few statements as indicated above. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a very interesting study, with the potential to improve parenting. Nowadays parents struggle to understand their children and how to deal with them effectively. It was however, not easy to follow through. The authors did not indicate the aim/objectives, methodology, data collection and analysis methods followed, any ethical considerations and recommendations. It is hard to determine if the objectives were met or not. This sounds more like a systematic review, if it is, kindly consider including the above information. 	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> It is hard to determine if there are any ethical issues because the nature of the study was not explained.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. B. Pitse
Department, University & Country	South Africa