

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_101868
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Rehabilitation Services for Addicts and Victims of Drug Abuse Quality at the National Narcotics Agency of North Sumatra Province, Indonesia
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes No. It needs revision No. It needs revision The manuscript has no evidence based scientific to support all statements in the result section. Many citations lacked a clear source.</p> <p>Abstract Please revise. 1. The abstract lacked coherence 2. The abstract should never include citations 3. The design of the study was unclear 4. The result was ambiguous 5. The absence of a conclusion in the abstract</p> <p>Abstract Keyword Please revise. The keyword should correspond with the study's title and objective.</p> <p>Introduction Please revise. 1. The introduction was ambiguous. There is no clear objective of the study. 2. The introduction must be simplified</p> <p>Method 1. No ethical approval for this research 2. No informed consent was obtained from the subjects. While all subjects were drug addicts and drug abuse victims, please refer to the WHO's ethical guidelines. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255721/9789241512657-eng.pdf 3. 3. The method for qualitative research was unclear.</p> <p>Result Please revise. 1. How did the author incorporate multiple themes into the results section? 2. There are no supporting or juxtaposing references All results and discussion statements were based on the author's perspective. Even for qualitative research, there must be some scientific evidence.</p> <p>Result Please revise. The conclusion was speculative. No statement that supports the study's title or purpose.\</p> <p>References Please revise. Many citations lacked a clear source. The references should adhere to the journal's referencing guidelines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. It needs revision</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Indrayadi Gunardi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia