

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_89290
Title of the Manuscript:	Compassion Fatigue and Satisfaction: A Professional Quality of Life (ProQoL) of Filipino Guidance Designates
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Conclusions that have not answered the purpose of the study should be narrated according to the variables studied	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Nous recommandons que l'introduction soit plus concise et ferme et placée dans la section méthodologie de recherche2. What is the novelty of the study3. As per the writing of your article with templet already in this journal4. The research methodology is complemented by a research introduction to clarify the course of the research5.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recommendations given too long will be good both firm and clear2. Discussions coupled with reputable international journals3. Discussion for quality of life needs additional reading resources that are up to date	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.6

	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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No Problem	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	plagiarism is suspected 10 % (No Problem)	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the reviewer:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"
I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)	
Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	Major Revision: (>7-8)

PART 5: Reviewer Details:

**This information is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate properly.
Certificate preparation will not be possible if incomplete information is received.**

Name of the Reviewer	Neila Sulung
Department of Reviewer	Nursing
University or Institution of Reviewer	University of Fort De Kock Bukittinggi Indonesia
Country of Reviewer	Bukittinggi
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Associate Professor
Email ID of Reviewer	neilasulung_64@yahoo.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer	085365658494
5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	