



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_9972
Title of the Manuscript:	Skin Color as Health Pathology: The Implications of Eurocentrism for Social Work Practice and Education
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This article seeks to tackle a very important topic – namely how dark skin color, no matter what ethnic background, affects health. However, in its current form, this article is not doing a good job in demonstrating how exactly blackness affects health. The problem begins with the imprecise usage of “people of color” – a 19th century term, not without racist undertones itself. It never becomes quite clear where the borders of this category are drawn. Does it include all nonwhites? Asians? Indians? More precision in this terminology is a must here. With more precision in this crucial category, the findings about the 23 Social Work publications might change. The author should include in his/her search such terms as “race,” “African Americans,” “black”, and racism. More than 23 articles might result – or not. As it is it is imprecise.</p> <p>The author then moves on to provide data from research conducted in different places, at different times. No original research is presented and none was conducted for this paper. As it is, it relies on secondary literature alone.</p> <p>A lot of the research quoted in support of the central argument does not support it. Sometimes, findings indicate that rural / urban residence explains more. The it seems that Mexican born women are more exposed to health risks. My suggestion here is to leave out all those</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>findings that find something else, not race, as the main cause for health problems - and present those that do find a significant correlation (not an “association”) in more detail. Sometimes, we do not learn when or where a study was conducted and sometimes the presented findings are outright confusing (e.g. what should we make of the finding that “ironically, skin color was not associated with depression for women born in the US or Mexican-born males.”? And what with “decreased Spanish language skills were significantly correlated to more depression among US born men and women.”? In the absence of a precise introduction of this study, the reader must ask: why would we expect American born people to speak Spanish – and what does it have to do with their mental health?</p> <p>Line 216: What is an “African Dr.?” Is the author referring to a specific African country? Which one?</p> <p>After line 235, the article becomes very repetitive and needs cutting back.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce and explain specific terms (ECG; LVH-EKG); - Many repetitions (e.g. lines 102-103 and 106-107) and the whole section after line 235. - Introduce and explain all the RELEVANT studies in detail and do not cite studies that do not offer directly relevant information. - The whole stress argument (lines 146 and following) needs more serious support from the literature, as it is not a very plausible argument to begin with. - Some comparisons are simply off, e.g. “Ironically, skin color was not associated with depression for women born in the US.” (line 190). Black women or just any women? In the absence of more precise information, the whole argument falls apart. - Who is Maama Adwoa (line 219)? Introduce her and the country. - 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>No original research; data presentation is inconsistent and incomplete; many repetitions; imprecise usage of terms and categories.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer