

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2942
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Causes of Personality Maladjustment from the Standpoint of Some Prominent Theories: A Literature Review
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is very important for the scientific community. It explains in simple terms causes of personality maladjustment as conceptualized by Carl Rogers, Erik Erikson, Sigmund Freud and Albert Ellis. I like it because it contains practical ideas that parents and aspiring parents, teachers and all individuals who work with children should embrace to promote mental health among children thereby minimizing their maladjustment in their present and later life.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is ok.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive enough. The only correction that should be done in this section is on the first of the four theories of maladjustment; it should read PERSON CENTRED THEORY. The self is one of the key concepts in this theory. How an individual perceives or experiences their SELF and how that affect personality adjustment is however very well explained later in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections as well as the structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, LITERATURE REVIEW should replace the sub title METHODOLOGY to give that section an appropriate title. On the same note, the first theory should read ROGERS' PERSON CENTRED THEORY and the concept of self brought in immediately. Alternatively, it can read ROGERS' CONCEPT OF SELF. Additionally, it should be ROGERS' not ROGER'S Rogers' five factors for a fully functioning person should be in a separate paragraph, and if possible briefly explained. The summary of Erikson's theory should form the last paragraph in that sub section. On the same breath "The way past conflicts at various stages of psychosexual development were resolved ..." should mark beginning of the last paragraph there.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is quite scientifically correct. However, verbal and physical aggression develop as a reaction to the perceived control of authority figures which cause frustrations and shame during toilet training at the anal stage of Freudian psychosexual theory. Overall, this manuscript is both robust and technically sound. As a Counsellor, Psychologist and Educator, I interact almost daily with the realities/practicalities of the ideas expressed therein, and always wish that parents get to know how their parenting practices shape their children for better or for worse; and that teachers would understand factors that influence learners' behaviours in the school environment. Such knowledge would inform their discipline	

[Review Form2](#)

	management strategies and rescue most learners from school adjustment problems they currently find themselves in.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate, relevant, and current.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, except that it should entirely be written in third party. Consequently, use of “we” / “our” should be avoided.	
Optional/General comments	This is a good piece of work	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Linah Anyango Ochieng’
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya