

Paper: “Absence of Fathers in Childrens' Lives of Divorced Parents: Impact and Implication”

Submitted: 02 August 2021

Accepted: 02 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Fabjana Maksutaj

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Zhaneta Ndregjoni
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 3: Liljana Billa Elmazi
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 4: Mondira Dutta
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

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!

Date Manuscript Received/:04/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: /05/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Divorce and Lack of Father Affect Children’s Perceptions to Insecurity for Successful Relationships and a Better Future	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0844/21	
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>
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

After looking carefully at the presented article, I find that the title is in line with the content of the text and quite clear, thus it expresses in synthesis the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
In the abstract are found all the necessary characteristics such as purpose, objectives, methodology, results and conclusions. I appreciate it quite positively.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The writing language may have some errors in the text which I think do not pose any problem.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The study method is based on theory and applied in the present case: comparing the perceptions of children coming from divorced families to those not divorced.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
From the whole study, some findings have emerged, as a result based on the comparison made. The results are clear and their implementation will serve the adolescents taken in the study for their future.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions are drawn on the basis of the study which I think are valid not only for the future of adolescents taken in the study, but also as references for other studies of this nature, without asking their accuracy.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The references are temporal and in line with the study, enabling the creation of the basis for its successful realization.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The comment on the author is related to the positive evaluation and the serious work she has done.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The comment on the publisher is related to the accuracy and speed of the operation, coming to aid not only to the PhDs candidates, but also the audience interested in these issues.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 04/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Divorce and lack of father affect children’s perceptions to insecurity for successful relationships and better future	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0844/21	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is in accordance with the content of the manuscript. Although a bit long it can stay as it is, as it fits well with the writing text.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract is concise, with all the necessary milestones starting from the purpose of the topic, objectives, methodology, instruments as well as conclusions and recommendations.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are some grammatical errors which are easily repairable, perhaps by a relevant language editor.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
In this article, is used comparative method, which means that the negative effects are compared to children with divorced parents versus those from intact families, based on a certain sample of children aged 13-18 in Tirana, Albania through the instrument of the questionnaire.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results come as a result of the study done and that are clear, concise and accurate according to the methodology used.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions together with the results of the study are in line with the content of the topic and of vital importance for adolescents who need security for the future.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The references are complete and appropriate including the subject matter of the study based on well-known social science authors over the years to date.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have no comments or suggestions for the author.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I have no comments or suggestions for the Editors.

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: Mondira Dutta	
University/Country: JN University, New Delhi, India	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 August 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 Aug 2021
Manuscript Title: Divorce and Lack of Father Affect Children's Perceptions to Insecurity for Successful Relationships and a Better Future	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0844/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	Yes/No YES
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Title may be shortened and made more focused.</i>	

<i>Consider “Absence of Father in the lives of Children: An Impact on Successful Relationships and Better Future”</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Fairly Good although the methodological tools could have been explained better instead of writing “collection of data and information, both theoretical and research, using contemporary literature”. This is very generic and is already understood.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The article does need a rereading. Sentences are too long and sometimes exceeds one whole paragraph, hence the meaning gets lost. For example the last paragraph of Abstract is all in one sentence thereby missing much clarity.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The element of a rationale and justification for the selection of sample is completely absent. For example why were 13-18 years olds selected? Why was a sample of 19 schools selected ? What were the strata in the stratified random sample? Was it gender wise or there were other consideration like age, background of parents marital status, etc? If yes what were the proportion of the strata in the sample. Some table ought to have been included showing the different strata and the magnitude of the sample size in each of these.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The graphical displays are not clear and tend to overlap on each other. The titles of the graphs need to be separated from the main graph. Results at times do not answer the objectives stated earlier.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Some case studies could have been included into the main study on the basis of which the conclusions could be developed	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
References are not in proper format. The references must be in the standard APA format. They need to be alphabetically arranged and the in-text quotes must be standardized.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Article can be improved manifold with some few changes as suggested

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: ---