



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_51925
Title of the Manuscript:	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PERCEPTION ON INTERGRATION OF PRISONERS INTO THE SOCIETY
Type of the Article	Short 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/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 (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	<p>Introduction: Though it has a good theoretical background, it fails to show the aims and purpose of the study and how the literature reviewed necessitates the research. This is very important and must be redressed.</p> <p>Materials and methods: The author must give a thorough information about the study sites for readers to appreciate the findings and see how best to apply it to similar conditions in other prisons globally.</p> <p>A map showing the location of the study areas will be good.</p> <p>How were the questionnaires for the quantitative data set administered? Was the same questionnaire used as an interview guide? What kinds of interactions were down (interview/FGD)? How many were conducted? How were the data recorded? How did you reach data saturation? How did you satisfy ethical issues?</p> <p>These questions must be thoroughly answered in the methods section. It makes the methods strong and robust.</p> <p>Results: I doubt if qualitative data was gathered as it is not evident in this section. If yes, then present some of the views (in quotes) of respondents. Represent percentages in the positions expressed (both affirmative and rebuttals).</p> <p>The discussions could have been more rigorous and academically engaging if MORE literature were discussed with the findings- both positive and opposing perspectives.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The review is current, rich and very informative. However, always link the review of literature with the current study to aggravate its relevance as well as why readers must give attention to you.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper's concept is good and needs to be published. However, the concerns raised in the review are equally important and if all are not efficiently addressed, would render the manuscript not publishable as it would taint the image of the journal (We stick to quality always). This would eventually translate in wider visibility of the paper after its publication as well as more citations (International readership).</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dickson Adom
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Technology, Ghana