

## 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article is important for the scientific community because it provides new information on the mental health of adolescents in school from research with a quantitative method.</p> <p>The title is long but appropriate</p> <p>It seems to me that in the abstract it should be clear that two instruments were applied to a random sample of students</p> <p>Subdivisions in the article are appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript has good scientific support but in descriptive studies like this one, it seems to me that research hypotheses are not necessary.</p> <p>references are appropriate</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In functional families family support is more likely; However, in some regions, at least a third of families are dysfunctional. On the other hand, the nuclear family typology where parents and children appear is not hegemonic in the populations; The highest figure we have found in our research is three out of five. This fact must be taken into account when talking about family support because there are families that do not have both parents.</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramón Eugenio Paniagua Suárez
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia