



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_51386
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in social inequality in exposure to bullying at school 1994-2018
Type of the Article	Short communication

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is a very well written paper. My main questions to the authors are: why did you lump infrequent bullying ("it has only happened once or twice") as non-exposed? I'm curious to know if this was done <i>a priori</i>, or post-hoc? In any case, it would benefit from a sensitivity analysis: are your trends preserved if you look at alternative exposure categories? Also, can you see if there is a "dose-response" relationship between the frequency of bullying and the OSC?</p> <p>Additionally, it might be helpful to mention what other factors may have played a role the trends observed. Critics of the research may claim that multiple other factors might be responsible in reduced exposure to bullying—you have outlined a few of them in your paper, but, I'm getting a sense from the authors themselves that they cannot lay stake to the claim that reduced social inequality reduces exposure (i.e., a causal link cannot be established). Just wanted to bring that up.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil.	
Optional/General comments	Thanks for providing me the opportunity to review your interesting and topical research article.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Anees Bahji</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Queen's University, Canada</i>