

Manuscript: “**Ragging: A Harmless Tradition or Menace? Perspective of Newly Admitted Medical Students of Karachi, Pakistan**”

**Submitted: 11 November 2020**

**Accepted: 15 March 2021**

**Published: 31 March 2021**

Corresponding Author: Angila Hasan

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n8p123

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Dr. Irfan Ullah, Kabir Medical College, Peshawar, Pakistan

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr Irfan Ullah	Email:
University/Country: Kabir Medical College, Peshawar/Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/1/2021
Manuscript Title: Ragging: A harmless tradition or menace? Perspective of newly admitted medical students of Karachi, Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: e-ISSN: 1857-7431	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Title seems clear to me.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Abstract has defined objective, method and result. Mild changes are needed like replace your sentence with “Out of 135, data of 102 participants were used in this study’. And do mention frequency (n) along with percentage (%) for results.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Few grammatical errors. Do proof read it again and use tenses like “According to this research” instead of “according to our research”</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Do mention the ethical protocols more clearly, Slight grammatical mistakes like commas”,” are missing and some prepositional mistakes.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>I found results and discussion very clear, however it still has room for further improvement like add (n) along with (%) in the table and graphs. Again don’t use tenses like “our participant”</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The conclusion summarizes the whole manuscript very well. It also highlighted the significance of research which is appreciated.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The References are adequate and cited in latest format of APA and organized Alphabetic wise in Reference list which is appreciated.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

- 1. The slight amendments are needed in abstract.**
- 2. Do add frequency (n) along with percentage (%) for your result presentation in table and graphs**
- 3. Replace the terms “our study” and “our participants” to “this study” and “according to the participants”**

- 4. In introduction, instead of “According to authors knowledge” use tenses like according to literature review.**
- 5. The entire work should also be proof-read to identify and correct grammatical errors.**
- 6. In conclusion and discussion it is mentioned that investigating the role of anti-ragging team was also an objective but not mentioned in Introduction (Paragraph of objectives of study, kindly mention it there as well).**
- 6. Overall a good manuscript, Accepted but need minor revision.**