

Manuscript: “**Domestic violence against children and adolescents in Taif, Saudi Arabia: Analytical study from the school counsellor’s perspective**”

**Submitted: 05 March 2021**

**Accepted: 19 March 2021**

**Published: 31 March 2021**

Corresponding Author: Eman Faisal

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n8p68

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Janaka Jayawickrama, University of York, United Kingdom

**Reviewer 2:** Oxana Bayer, Dnipropetrovsk Oles Honchar University, Ukraine

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

It is almost clear and I think that Saudi Arabia should be inserted to the Title, so that it is clearer.

Domestic violence against children and adolescents in Taif, Saudi Arabia: Analytical study from the school counsellor's perspective

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract is clear and decent. However, a strong edit of the abstract would help.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

The paper needs a closer proofreading. There are certain aspects that are not very clear to the reader (see my comments in the paper).

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Actually, the study methods are overly explained and I suggest that there is a clearer explanation and justification of the methodological framework (see my comments in the paper).

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

In general, the authors managed to explain their research well, but need further additions to the Results and Discussion section of the paper.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

I have suggested the Conclusion to be revised.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The references are fine.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I think that you have conducted an important research. However, you need to carefully think through how you present your research, findings, discussion and recommendations to an international audience. I have inserted some detailed comments and suggestions within the paper. Please see how you can respond to them.

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes, it is.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract does not provide distinct information as for what results interviewing brought (and neither does the article itself).

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes, there are. These are not misprints but some grammatical errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

As I have written before, the method of interviewing seems to be odd and not expedient.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The research questions are formulated so that I seem to get lost in the difference between them.

The sample for the questionnaire (page 5) runs as 48 but it seems to be 84.

The method of the interview does not seem to be necessary within what is written in the research procedure. The results of the interviewing section are not anyhow mentioned.

The discussion section lacks any mention of the possible mediating factors. For instance, if a school is "crowded", does this indicate to the fact that a student comes from a low-income family? Can there be any other factors that can interfere into the relationship of the studied phenomena?

The paper does not have "Limitations" section.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

Some conclusions do not seem to come out of the research which is described in the paper.

Again, there seem to be no conclusions coming out of the interviewing section.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Formatting of some references does not follow the rules.

Some references (like "A dictionary of psychology") would better be changed for either topical research works or newer papers.

**Please rate the TITLE of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the METHODS of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

**Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.**

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2

- 3

- 4

- 5

**Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.**

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2

- 3

- 4

- 5

**Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.**

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2

- 3

- 4

- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed

- Accepted, minor revision needed

- Return for major revision and resubmission

- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**