|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**](https://journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JSRR\_132472** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE AMONG LATE ADOLESCENTS** |
| Type of the Article |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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 manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a reliable and valid tool to assess interpersonal relationships among late adolescents, a crucial stage of social and emotional development. By considering different family structures, the study offers valuable insights into how interpersonal relationships vary based on upbringing and environment. The development of the Interpersonal Relationship Scale (IRS) can aid researchers, psychologists, and educators in better understanding and addressing social challenges faced by young adults. This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on adolescent psychology and can serve as a foundation for future research and interventions.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title of the article is clear, but it could be more concise and engaging. A more refined title could be:**  **"Development and Validation of an Interpersonal Relationship Scale for Late Adolescents"**  **This version maintains clarity while making it more direct and professional. It also emphasizes the key focus of the study without unnecessary complexity.** |  |
| 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 provides a clear overview of the study, but it could be improved by including the key findings in more detail. Mentioning specific reliability and validity scores would strengthen the credibility of the scale. Additionally, the abstract could briefly highlight the practical implications of the Interpersonal Relationship Scale (IRS) in research or real-world applications. Lastly, improving the flow by avoiding repetition (such as "Interpersonal Relationship Scale" multiple times) would make it more concise and engaging. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound, but there are areas that could be improved for clarity and precision. It correctly follows the process of scale development, including content validity, reliability testing, and sample selection. However, providing specific reliability and validity scores would strengthen the scientific rigor. Additionally, a clearer explanation of how the selected dimensions of interpersonal relationships were determined would enhance transparency and completeness. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references include a mix of relevant studies, but there are some areas for improvement. While some sources are recent, others are older and could be updated with more current research on adolescent interpersonal relationships. Additionally, citations from well-established psychological and social science journals would strengthen the manuscript’s credibility. Including references specifically focused on interpersonal relationship measurement tools or similar scale development studies would provide a stronger foundation for the research.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the article is generally clear, but it could be refined for better readability and academic tone. Some sentences are slightly repetitive or could be structured more concisely to improve flow. Additionally, minor grammatical corrections and more precise wording would enhance its suitability for scholarly communication. Ensuring consistent use of academic terms and improving sentence transitions would make the article more polished and professional. |  |
| Optional/General comments | It is well-structured and scientifically sound, but it requires some major revisions to improve clarity, language, and ethical transparency. Refining the abstract, strengthening the references with more recent studies, ensuring ethical considerations are clearly addressed, and improving academic tone will enhance the quality of the manuscript. Once these improvements are made, it has strong potential for acceptance. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Sohini Bhattacharyya, West Bengal University of Teachers’ Training, India**