

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_111595</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Family Support and its Relationship with the Level of Psychological Immunity among a Sample of High School Students at Erbil Schools</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes. However, the phrase, 'a sample of' is redundant and does not make the title smart. It should be expunged and details of sample and sampling techniques provided under methodology.</b></li> <li>3. <b>No. Key statistical findings (figures) should be extracted and highlighted accordingly. Repetitions should be avoided. Key recommendation should also be highlighted to make the abstract more comprehensive. Words used in the title should be consistent with the ones used as key words. For instance, High school was used in the title whereas, Secondary school was used under key words.</b></li> <li>4. <b>No. The subsections and structure were more of research project or dissertation than an article in a scientific journal. It was more of an upload of the entire final project work as it was presented to the institution of graduation with about 29 pages. Author should diligently go through the guidelines and present in line with recommended structure of this journal. All subsections should be subsumed mainly, under (introduction, methods, results).</b></li> <li>5. <b>Yes. However, there were so many unnecessary repetitions, grammatical errors, incoherent tenses in terms of flow and much verbosity. Statement of the problem was weak, muddled with a lot of avoidable 'literature review'. Research gap was not clearly identified/stated. Reporting was more in present tense instead of past tense throughout the work. Sampling technique could not provide clear information on how sample figure (710) was exactly arrived at (was figure assumed?). Details in tables 1-7 under research sample can expressed in one or two sentences without diminishing its relevance. Source of study population should be properly cited/referenced. Methodology should be concise and not too verbose. Discussions with citations were done both under the tables for each item and repeated under discussion of findings. Write-ups under the tables should merely present results as shown on each table in a concise manner while discussions on the issues should be done under discussion of findings.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Not really. Out of 29 references, 13 were unpublished which suggests over-reliance on sources that are yet to undergo peer-review or other acceptable forms of integrity test. About half or a little more were from 2010 upwards while the rest were below. More published works should be introduced to increase the integrity of the paper. Reference style should also be consistent for all the articles and references completely presented (not just title &amp; a few features)</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The subsections/structure of this work requires serious attention. Going through Publisher's guideline will be very helpful in this regard.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Iloma Unwobuesor Richard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rivers State College of Health Science and Management Technology, Nigeria</b>