

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_129678
Title of the Manuscript:	How the Presence of an Authority Figure Influences Individual Choices and Stress Levels: a One-Time Experimental Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research is not well appreciated by the scientific community. The major concern of this paper is human resource management and the use of authority. It is more beneficial for social science researchers and the community. It has further application in child rearing and other fields as well, where instant and close supervision leads to violence and disobedience perspectives.	Thank you for your thoughtful feedback regarding the importance and relevance of our research. We appreciate your acknowledgment of the potential applications of our study in social science research, human resource management, child-rearing, and other related fields.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable; however, it is suggested that instead of individual, the plural individuals with an apostrophe sign make it more appealing.	This comment is acknowledged and the title has been changed. Thank you.
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.	The abstract is correct as it provides a brief summary of what has been done and how it has been done.	Thank you.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is scientifically correct but needs more improvement to impress the research community. The researchers need a major review of the Typoglycemia that has been demonstrated. The subject-verb agreement principle has been badly violated. If the manuscript is numbered, a few examples can be seen on lines 53 and 65. These results show that literature is a collective noun; its plural has been used..... 81.90, 110;449. A major review of the language is suggested.	Typoglycemia has been reviewed and changed. The subject-verb agreement has been changed on the lines 53 and 65.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A research paper is a contribution of literature and theory in the existing fields of knowledge. A literature review functions as a bridge between past and future works. However, this manuscript finds a scarcity of the reviewed literature. It is suggested that more research works be added to make this work appealing.	We acknowledge the importance of incorporating recent studies to enhance the comprehensiveness and relevance of our work. However, after an extensive search, we were unable to locate recent studies (2020 onwards) directly related to our research topic. To address this limitation, we have expounded upon the existing related literature already mentioned in the manuscript.

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>As suggested earlier, the language needs a major review. 2. The manuscript uses the language of a synopsis, using the future tense. The research has been conducted, and the results have been achieved. So, in the conclusion chapter, instead of writing "the researchers will examine," it should be written as "the researchers have examined."</p>	<p>The language has been thoroughly edited to ensure clarity and coherence. Additionally, the use of future tense has been corrected throughout the manuscript, particularly in the conclusion chapter, where phrases such as "the researchers will examine" have been replaced with "the researchers have examined" to accurately reflect the completed research.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Population size needs to be rationalized. Why was this sample chosen? A sample size of forty.... Why not 41 or 39? What theoretical framework has been used? These questions need to be elaborated on in this world.</p>	<p>Thank you for raising concerns about the rationalization of the sample size. The sample size of forty was selected based on the guidelines provided in <i>Experimental Psychology</i> by Anne Myers and Christine Hansen, which emphasize its appropriateness for studies of this nature. This framework was chosen to ensure the reliability and validity of our findings while adhering to established methodologies in experimental psychology.</p> <p>We have elaborated on this justification in the revised manuscript to address your feedback and provide greater clarity regarding the rationale behind our choice.</p>

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(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)</i></p>
<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>	