

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_85557
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychosocial Correlates of Depression among Apprentice Artisans in Nigeria
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Hypotheses are more general than it could be - statistical method (hierarchical regression) need some more complex and specific hypotheses (i.e. why such an order of regressors was chosen? What's the implication(s) of that choice?)</li><li>2) In correlation matrix and regression some regressors (i.e. <i>Family Type</i>) seem to be measured on the nominal measurement level, but authors report them (and df in table 2 confirm that) as scale measurement level variables. This (technically small) change in the structure of dataset implies some (I believe not trivial) changes in interpretation of observed result</li></ol>	Revised
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The "Discussion" section is not highly related to the section of "Results" - there is only discussion on the correlation matrix, but results of regression are omitted,</li><li>2) Studies cited in the "Discussion" suggest that some effects of moderation could be expected (i.e. stronger effect of burnout on depression in population of adults than adolescents or in population of small families than large families), but such analyses are not reported,</li></ol>	Revised
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) I'd suggest reconsideration of hypotheses and analyses to make them more consistent,</li><li>2) I'd suggest reduce hierarchical regression to two steps (1 - demography, 2 - demography + psychology) or three steps (1 - demography, 2 - demography + psychology and 3 - demography + psychology + some interactions if possible)</li></ol>	Noted

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	