Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJASS_63562**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND ADDICTION AMONG UNDERGRADUATES IN NIGERIAN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES; COMMUNICATING BEHAVIOURAL CHANGE FOR SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	**1. Introduction** Leads the reader into the context and the scope of the topic however some statements in the first three paragraphs needs to be sourced or referenced. For instance: • One fact of life that must be accepted is that drug taking is a part of human culture (provide source) • Today, more Nigerian youths are becoming drug dependents (provide source) **It would be interesting to include them.** **2. Statement of the Problem** **Some statements here need referencing or source (It would be interesting to include them). For instance:** • Early researches in this regard have established the negative impact of substance abuse on the nation's social, political and economic well-being and development (who are those researchers? State at least two or three references) • Human beings have used drugs in a variety of ways to improve their total well-being. (it will be interesting to provide a few variety of ways with their sources of references) 3. **Research Questions** **I realized research themes were used. It would improve the manuscript if you change them into sub-research questions or objectives.** 4. **Review of related literature** **It was realized that some of the references are over a decade old. Some over 20 and others over 30 years. Please, report other studies and include recent literature (within the last five to ten years, 2010-2020).** **5. Research Methodology** It is worthwhile to discuss: • Research design and approach. • Methodological norms, e.g. internal and external validity or credibility and trustworthiness. • ethical issues and procedures I would have rather have used a semi structured interview guide instead of a structured interview on a smaller sample to gain in-depth information, allow flexibility in sharing and probe more on the issue. This is due to the sensitivity of the problem. **6. Data Analysis Procedure** **Briefly state the procedure or technique used to analyse the qualitative data obtained.** 7. Discussion **Most of the discussions were compared with very old studies. It will be interesting to compare with recent ones (between 1 to 10 years)** **8. References**	1. Introduction Comment noted. Some of the statements are from the authors. Nevertheless, some sources have been included and statement replaced where necessary. 2. Statement of problem has been revised based on reviewer's comment . 3. Research objectives and questions have been used instead of research themes. 4. Review of related literature- References that are over 20 years old and above are the theories used. 5. Research methodology, data analysis, and discussion- revised as advised by reviewer.

	References are sufficiently adequate but some were not used correctly according to accepted conventions. Some need revision and also dates of retrieval for the ones from website need to be provided.	
Optional/General comments	The topic is interesting and innovative. I belief if the changes can be made, it will meet the required international standards.	

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)*	