

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_99514
Title of the Manuscript:	CAUSES AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL EFFECTS OF CHILD TRAFFICKING IN NORTH WOLLO ZONE
Type of the 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The research is important, the topic is sensitive, but the results of the region are important to share. The title matches the content. The theoretical part and the methodology are prepared appropriately, the research procedure can be supplemented. The structure of the article is suitable, the numbering from chapter 3 needs clarification. Figures must all be referenced in the text.</p> <p>There are an appropriate number of sources, only 5 are sources from the last 5 years. Citation of some sources should be corrected.</p> <p>In the discussion of the study, a comparison is made between the theory and the results of the study, as well. In the report, the research questions have been answered and the attached recommendations, which are quite traditional, could be supplemented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use of language is understandable, appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Research findings are worth sharing. The article has a disturbing number of typographical and space errors.</p> <p>The font style needs to be harmonized in many places.</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:	Maarika Veigel
Department, University & Country	Tallinn University, Estonia