

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_96130
Title of the Manuscript:	Situational Analysis of the Willingness to accept Interns, Benefits and Challenges of Academic Internship Programmes to Host Organisations: Empirical Evidence from Ghana
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)
Compulsory 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. "Situational Analysis of the Willingness to accept Interns, Benefits and Challenges of Academic Internship Programmes to Host Organisations" –the topic is very innovative and important for scientific community. 2. The title of the article is also suitable in Ghana prospective. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and perfectly organized. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and perfectly organized. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The number of references is 41 which is sufficient for any journal paper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-Need to check grammatical and sentence structure before the final submission	
Optional/General comments	-Summary of all findings, results and conclusion part are not clear enough for submitting this paper. Please rewrite before final submission. -Add a section named summary of all findings if possible. If not explain and justify -What is the findings from all literature review? Explain and Justify.	

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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Albina Amin
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh University of Professionals, Bangladesh