

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: April, 5 th 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: April 6 th , 2017
Manuscript Title: Does not having a living child increase women’s risk of intimate partner violence? Evidence from 2008-2013 Nigeria Demographic and Health Surveys	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0451/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Taking into account the manuscript and the analyses, I would suggest change the title (e.g. Does not having a living child increase....)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The main goal of the study should be more clear and visible. Key words: Intimate partner violence instead of partner violence.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Authors said: Based on Nigeria DHS, this study provided empirical evidence that not having a living child does not increase women's risk of partner violence. → I think results emphasized that having living children does increase women's risk of IPV. Conclusions are directed towards male involvement. However I don't find this line clear, according to results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: