

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_91557
Title of the Manuscript:	BREAKING THE SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR STUDENTS' TRUANCY
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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>* In the manuscript title The Article's title shows the main content and purpose, is informative, straightforward and contains highlights from finding article content. It's better if the title is revised.</p> <p>* Manuscript structure and source (a) Generally, the main part of a scientific article consists of subsections/subtitles: Introduction, research methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion. Please adjust your article writing by following the standard article structure. (b) You should avoid presentation/description on the body text in your manuscript in the form of a pointer, change it in the form of a narrative sentence. Please revise it.</p> <p>* In the Introduction subsection (a) You must provide even more compelling reasons why the topic in your research is essential for review (Please consider increasing the background discussion which can further strengthen the need for this review research to be carried out. (b) Authors need to state/mention the purpose of the research in the introduction subsection after reviewing why the research topic is essential or after reviewing the gap analysis. Please complete it. (c) The description of the related work in the Introduction subsection should be from the latest publication (not more than 5 years old). Please complete it, so that it shows the critical review you did referring to the source of the latest article/research.</p> <p>* In the Research Question subsection It's best to avoid using Research Questions subtitles. So it is better to describe it as part of the discussion carried out in the introduction sub section.</p> <p>* In the Methodology subsection (a) The authors should include a block diagram or flowchart of the sequence or stages of the methodological process carried out in the research. (b) References that are more than 10 years old are not suitable to be used as references because their knowledge is outdated. Remove references that are over 10 years old and above as cited references and replace them with the latest published articles.</p> <p>* In the Conclusion subsection In the Conclusion subsection, the authors not only describe the research findings but also provide suggestions for further research on the shortcomings of the research carried out. Please complete it.</p> <p>* In the Recommendation subtitle (a) It is better to combine the Recommendation subtitle with the Conclusion subtitle so that it becomes one Conclusion and Recommendation or just Conclusion subtitle. Consider combining them. Thank You (b) You should avoid presentation/description on the body text in your manuscript in the form of a pointer, change it in the form of a narrative sentence. Please revise it.</p> <p>* In the Reference subtitle (a) The number of journal references is dominated by old references; preferably, the latest journal references (the last five years) are added to references/articles. (b) Authors should cite articles from the ARJASS</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthony Anggrawan
Department, University & Country	Bumigora University, Indonesia