

Paper: “**Harassment of Women in University and Public Transport**”

Submitted: 10 September 2021

Accepted: 23 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Sumbal Shah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p39

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Imran Rafiq
University of Malakand, Pakistan

Reviewer 3: 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!

Reviewer Name: Mondira Dutta	
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University, INDIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 Sept 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 Sept 2021
Manuscript Title: Harassment of Female Students and Employees in University and Public Transport	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0975/21	
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>The abstract although clear but the title may be reconsidered as <u>“Harassment of Women in Public and University Transport”</u>. The details can always be explained in the abstract rather than elongating the title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract will be better if the repetition of the words “The researcher” is avoided. Instead address it as ‘The Study’. Language needs to be more professional. Better keywords could be selected.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The paper does need a re-reading. Language is rather amateur. Some revision of the paper will fix the issue</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Under the subhead ‘Results’, there is no need to mention that the respondents filled their age and gender. It is understood that it’s a study to understand the female harassment. The line “Among all of these reported their age and gender as well as their qualification” may be deleted.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results would be clearer if depicted through small tables and a few graphs for the same such as, age and occupation types of Respondents, Urban /Rural, purpose of travelling and other such parameters. Most of the recommendations are basically findings which can be amalgamated under the results. Based on the findings two or three clear recommendations may be submitted under bullet points. The last subhead (Limitations) may be added under methodology.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>A para may be added as concluding remarks before recommendations, regarding the difficulties faced by the women commuters in Mardan, of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, Pakistan. A line or two may be added on the given security conditions in the region with women being allowed to move freely.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Remove the serial numbers of references. Only state the reference of those which have been quoted in the text. Not those which have not been. Most of the literature do not talk about Pakistan based women commuters. Some studies may be included that are at least Pakistan (Area Specific) if not on Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province,</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please get this edited before submission

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr. Imran Rafiq	
University/Country: university of Malakand, Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 2/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/11/2021
Manuscript Title: HARASSMENT OF FEMALE STUDENTS AND EMPLOYEES IN UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1	
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.

<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.	2

<i>The title of the paper is not seems like an article's title but rather an easy on harassment.it need to be revised , the title is in capital font it need to be first letter capital of every word having more than 4 letters.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The key elements of the abstract are missing like the results, model significance population size, data analysis software, techniques are not given. The overall abstract seem like written in hurry without professional help. For BS level student its good effort but to be considered in international journal it need to be up to that standards.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are certain sentences that have grammatical and technical writing issue. It needs to be checked by English language expert.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The technique for data analysis are missing completely there are no table, charts, graphs, results, theoretical frame work, variables identification, sample size, is also not justified, the city of mardan have approx. 358000 population size in 2017 only 50 people cannot justify the results.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results shows descriptions of the results not proven by any mean, no analysis are reported and the results are given, so it is hard to justify whatever results are mentioned is true and error free. as there are no evidence to prove how that was achieved, model significance, reliability statistics, validity of the instruments , data collection techniques which are employed for this work cannot be justified as the population is not known , the convenience sampling should be the right choice in this regards not simple random.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>I cannot agree with the summary, conclusion that could be accurate as there are so many issues with this paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Reference shall be according to the journal reference requirements. Normally APA 6 styles but do confirm with journals obligations.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear research first of all I would like to encourage you for the effort you make to write a research work, it is understandable that you are just a BS level student so I encourage you for that. There are so many things that need to be learn, scientific research are more

rigors each and every steps need to be carefully taken. I would suggest you sit with some professional and learn more in this regards.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: