

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_98537
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Orientation Programmes On Fresh Students In The Colleges of Education in Ghana: A case of St. Monica's College of Education
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:

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

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The article title given is by the article's contents. 3. The abstract fulfilled important points. Such as research objectives, research methodology, research subjects and sampling techniques, and research results. however, the data analysis used has not yet been described. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, the methodology section does not explain in detail the instruments used and data collection techniques. In addition, the explanation regarding the design, population, and sample is not very clear. In addition, the research findings are less than the literature used. it would be better if the research findings are explained more than the literature. 5. Scientifically, the manuscript is correct. 6. The article references are in the latest edition, but there are several references that have been used over the past 10 years. Please add the latest references, because fewer references are used and use references that are past the last 10 years. 7. Research findings are not enough to answer research questions. 8. Kindly pay attention to writing techniques that must be adapted to the journal template. especially reference writing. whether to use APA style or other types. 9. Please add GAP research analysis so that the novelty of this research is clear.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Kindly use standard words, such as "Background to the study" instead of "introduction".	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	in general the article is good, coherent, and interesting.	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indah Suciati
Department, University & Country	Alkhairaat University, Indonesia