

Manuscript: **“The Open Secret Of Male Prostitution In The Philippines: A Descriptive Phenomenological Study”**

**Submitted: 05 April 2021**

**Accepted: 11 May 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: Soren R. Sanchez

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p73

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1 :** Seyydi Faranak, Azad University of Arak, Iran

**Reviewer 2:** Iresha Madhavi Lakshman, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: seyydi. faranak	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: STORIES BEHIND MALE PROSTITUTION IN THE PHILIPPINES: A DESCRIPTIVE PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    ✓ 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	

## **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>2/5</b>
The title should be corrected and the word story should be removed	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The methodology should be more fully expressed in the abstract	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</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):**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: IM Lakshman	
University/Country: University of Colombo, Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 05.04.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.04.2021
Manuscript Title: STORIES BEHIND MALE PROSTITUTION IN THE PHILIPPINES: A DESCRIPTIVE PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 57	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Some statistics are presented in page 2-3. However, they only indicate male-male relationships. Not indicative of associations with male prostitutes. This needs clarification in order to formulate the research problem more clearly.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Language needs editing.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Grammar needs a careful checking.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Quotes can be given only in English. No need for vernacular/ original quote.  The table needs to be numbered.  The table makes it easier for the reader to follow the story that the author is trying to tell. However, it also makes it unnecessary to read the later details. May be consider adding it as a summary after the detailed analysis.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Some authors/ organizations mentioned in the text are not present in the reference list. A careful cross checking is required.</i>	

**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):**