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**PART 1: Comments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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 research is significant to scientific thinking because it provides insightful information regarding child abuse, post-adoption environments and their health. In addition to increasing awareness on physical abuse and issues related to trauma and stress, the findings can be very helpful in offering counselling services to adopted children in order to enhance their mental health. Furthermore, this study has broader ramifications for improving adaptive processes for reducing nonaccidental injuries and pediatric, which can be applied to broaden social worker research internationally and eventually support better psychological stress management and mental health among vulnerable populations. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, it is suitable |  |
| **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 gives a fair understanding of the study and setting. However, it could be altered to include certain missing essential points:   1. The abstract's introduction needs improvement. The author must describe the non-accidental injuries, their relation on child abuse, and adaptive post adoption environment in a minimum of three to five lines. 2. The author should avoid mentioning keywords in the abstract. The keywords have only to come after the abstract. There is much to be said about non-accidental injuries and child abuse. 3. The abstract is not properly framed. It should include a proper constructed objectives or aim of the study, summary of the approach and reviews/findings, which are now absent and missing 4. The findings are not clear; therefore, it should be re-done. 5. It would be useful to include a quick summary of major results or insights from the research. Consider how children suffer from abuse and effects on their mental status. 6. Emphasize Significance: The abstract should highlight the study's importance and consequences for mental health issues. A statement describing how the findings will help improve children who have been abused and mental health and the implementation of the policies by mentioning them. | Yes sir changed |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | It is fair to say that the manuscript is scientifically correct because it was carried out in accordance with accepted research procedures. However, in order to be more scientific, a few aspects need to be clarified:   1. The introduction, literature review, methodology Conclusion, discussion and recommendations and other components of the format should be enhanced and follow the numbering e.g 1.0 Introduction, 2.0 Literature review etc. 2. The introduction is done fairly well, however it contains a lot of information that, if at all possible, literature review to be added. The author should introduce methodology by mentioning procedures e.g research design, tools, analysis and improve the discussion and conclusion by including more recent concerns and studies, such as mental health and child abuse. 3. In order to further close the gap on research solutions and future directions, it is crucial that the recommendations from the discussed and be incorporated in this article scientifically by describing the results and identifying the gap and suggestions | Yes sir adjusted as per advice |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, and it is of more recent | Thanku sir |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language used in the text is generally of high quality, easily understood, well-structured and academically strengthened making it appropriate for scholarly communication. However, there are certain instances of strange phrasing, repetitive phrase patterns and grammatical errors that might be fixed for better understanding and clarity. Some sentences are lengthy and complex, making them difficult to interpret. Transitions between concepts could also be made simpler to comprehend in order to enhance the logical flow of arguments. | Re checked and corrected sir |
| **Optional/General** comments | If the previously mentioned corrections are made for academic field efficacy, the essay is well-written and well done.  **Table 1 and 2 are not clear. Kindly explain all the tables well to be understood.** | Yes sir thanku done |

**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)* |  |