

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_107813
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIAL CHALLENGES FACING EX-PRISONERS DURING THEIR INTEGRATION INTO SOCIETIES IN IRINGA MUNICIPALITY, TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What types of citation employed in your study? If it is APA style, it require alphabetical order rather than chronological order. And if the number of authors more than two you can cite as "et al." 2. You need to show gaps, limitations, controversies, and current trends of the problems from the context of social challenges of ex-prisoners while they are re-integrate into societies. More importantly, what are your research questions or objectives, your study specifically try to address? 3. You are already mention that both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. As such, you are expected to look at both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Therefore, this study should follow pragmatism philosophy which preferable to mixed method design rather than cross-sectional design. Please refer the current research methodology by Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Fifth Edition. SAGE Publications, Inc. This study seems more of qualitative research, you have only fifty sample and all of your sampling techniques employed in your study were non-probability. 5. How much is your total population? If they are 200, it is better to include all of them as they are few population in quantitative approach. 6. If you didn't employed probability sampling methods, why you use sample size formula? Which sampling techniques employed to select 50 participants of your study? It is not clear whether this study is quantitative or qualitative research or the combination of the two? 7. How did your questionnaire constructed? Are you adopt or adapt it? You have to clearly state the procedures and preparations of the instruments used in this study. 8. You need to state step-by-step how quantitative data was analysed and qualitative data also analysed. Otherwise, it seems vague and overlapping. 9. Which tool? Qualitative or quantitative? How many items included in your questionnaire? What part of the research objective it measure? 10. What is the Cronbach's alpha (α) value of your questionnaire? 11. The reliability and validity assessment of the scales based on statistical analysis methods should clearly stated. 12. It is better and fruitful if you are presented your result and discussion part separately and orderly in line with your research objectives. 13. Better if you didn't use direct respondent name rather symbolic name as participant "X" or "Y" or any alternative that represent your interviewee. 14. How did you triangulate your quantitative data with the qualitative data? 15. If and only if this study parts of mixed method, such findings should concluded. Otherwise, how a cross-sectional design with qualitative methodology can reach on such 	

Review Form 1.7

	conclusion, for me, your study, methodologically sounded illogical and wrong. 16. The methodology parts of the paper needs serious revision to evaluate the findings of the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wondu Teshome
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia