



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_47405
Title of the Manuscript:	PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION AND THE PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL MOLESTATION AMONG ADOLESCNTS
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>)

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	Abstract does not follow abstract format and so does not meet the publication standard. It should be in block form, single spaced, and in italics. There should be no paragraph, no sub-headings. Everything should be in sentence form. The statement of the problem, the objectives of the study, and research questions are not stated. The hypothesis is not stated, though it is used in the results. Tables 2&2 used research objectives instead of research questions. Opinions are not strong enough to support findings. Findings from other works are used. In reference, current APA format is not used. Secondly, dates of citations are not appropriately placed in some references. The citations too obsolete., most recent, 2011 . The citations should be up-dated with current views and findings of 2012-2018. Many citations are omitted in references.	
Minor REVISION comments	1st and 2nd sentences of the background of the study are clumsy. Other grammatical errors are detected in the work and should be corrected. There should be a link between the background of the study and the theoretical frame work.	
Optional/General comments	Nil.	

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>	

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:	Maria Agbo
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Education, Eha Amufu, Nigeria