



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_46958
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND DETERMINANTS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AMONG MARRIED MEN IN OSOGBO, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>The manuscript as currently written is missing many references, especially when the authors are making the claims about men as victims. For example,</p> <p>“When IPV occurs among men, they are less likely to seek help and to report the event, especially in patriarchal settings (e.g., sub-Saharan Africa). Violence against men is typically in the psychological or emotional domain, whereas men are more likely to initiate physical violence on their female partners.”</p> <p>I am not trying to suggest male-centered IPV is not an issue, but making claims such as those above without support is troublesome.</p> <p>Similarly, on page 3, it is written,</p> <p>“IPV poses a threat to the health of men. The effect of IPV is profound affecting their physical and psychological health. It also leads to morbidity and mortality, reduced productivity and reduced quality of life. Whereas women who experience IPV are openly encouraged to report it to authorities, it has been argued that men who experience such often encounter pressure against reporting, with those that do facing social stigma regarding their perceived lack of machismo and other denigrations of their masculinity. Additionally, IPV against men is generally less recognized by society than IPV against women, which can act as a further block to men reporting their situation.”</p> <p>These claims need to each be supported by evidence and a reference. Saying that women are “openly encourage to report it to the authorities” hugely misrepresents the issues women encounter when they are in an abusive relationship. Most women do not report because the “authorities” often don’t believe them, or know the perpetrator, or themselves believe in men exerting “control” over “their woman”. There is a huge literature on why women do not report. I am not suggesting that men have it easy to report this kind of violence, but to say women are encourage to report is misleading and contrary to published evidence.</p> <p>Perhaps even more troublesome is this section:</p> <p>“previous studies have focused mainly on the prevalence of IPV amongst women in various parts of Nigeria. This raises a host of questions about why IPV is socially constructed to the point that male victims and female perpetrators are virtually invisible and this has major implications for society in general and public policy in particular.”</p> <p>The authors have an opportunity to discuss why it is that men as victims are largely invisible. Partly, this is because, in general, in society, men hold the power. Therefore, as a group, it is hard to see men as the victim. This is not to suggest that I do not think men can be victims, but this would be an excellent place to discuss the issues of toxic masculinity and the very real, very negative impacts that can have on men. Given that men hold most of the power in society, and also in interpersonal relationships, it would be really hard for me to seek services.</p> <p>The methods section needs more information. It is stated how the scores were interpreted, but not how they were generated. I am not familiar with the Conflicts Tactics Scale and there is no information regarding how the three domains of abuse were conceptualized or operationalized. How many questions were asked? What are they?</p> <p>In the results section, it is stated, “the respondents who have the three types of intimate partner violence are classified as having IPV.” Does this mean only those who reported at least once instance of all three were classified as having IPV?</p> <p>Just before that, it is written, “31% were exposed to intimate partner violence using the respondents who scored up to and above the mean”. What does this mean? Similarly, I am not sure what “based on summary score” mean in the other figures. All of this needs to be clearly laid out in the methods section.</p> <p>The figures need to be cleaned up (the titles look they are from the statistical package). I would also urge the authors to see if all the pie charts are necessary. They take up a lot of room and don’t really tell much that couldn’t be presented in a much more austere manner.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>It looks like a chi-square analysis was conducted on the “fertility problem” cross-tab, however, the cell count is only 4 which makes the chi-square test not appropriate. Also, how was “fertility problem” determined? This needs to be mentioned in the methods section.</p> <p>All of the tables take up a lot of room and are hard to read. They need to be reformatted.</p> <p>In the methods section, only chi-square and Students T test are listed, but in the results, there is a binary logistic regression. This needs to be mentioned in the methods section. Also, is this a multivariate regression? How was it determined which variables would be entered into it? Just those that were significant in chi-square?</p> <p>Why didn’t the authors do any multivariate analysis? Age of respondent and age of wife are associated. Surely these are measuring the same phenomenon? Adjusting for multiple predictors is warranted.</p> <p>These are cross-sectional data; saying that something is a “predictor” of IPV (as in the title of Table 5 and the first line of the discussion) suggests causality which, given these data, the authors cannot determine.</p> <p>It is noted that wife’s employment is positively associated with men reporting IPV. The authors do not, however, delve into this at all. What could be the reason(s) for this phenomenon? Just leaving this hanging out there without delving into some thoughtful analysis is vexing (because, if it is true that women are more likely to be perpetrators if they have jobs, are we suggesting women shouldn’t be employed?) Since it isn’t clear how IPV was measured, it’s hard to know what these results suggest, but I do know that women who have jobs outside the home are also at higher risk of being the victims of IPV. Is self-defense included in the measure of IPV in this study?</p> <p>This sentence needs attention: “Fifty two (38.0%) whose ages were forty and below experienced IPV while forty one (25.2%) of those whose ages were 40 years and below experienced IPV.”</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	There are a few grammatical errors (i.e. “data” is plural, tense issues, especially in the methods section)	
Optional/General comments		

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarah Rominski
Department, University & Country	University of Michigan, USA