

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJASS_96130</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Situational Analysis of the Willingness to accept Interns, Benefits and Challenges of Academic Internship Programmes to Host Organisations: Empirical Evidence from Ghana</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research</b>

**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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is adequate, it represents the paper in its parts. The Keywords are good</p> <p>The introduction and background are appropriate, clear, and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated to support the subject. This section is suitable to build on the next parts. Suggested proofreading and editing [see attached Corrected Manuscript] More references are required... Write a brief paragraph how is this paper divided??</p> <p>The literature review is also appropriate, clear, and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated to support the subject. Suggested proofreading and editing [see attached Corrected Manuscript]</p> <p>The methodology is clear and appropriate. Suggestions are made. Calculations are wrong as shown. Therefore, a suggestion was made based on the declared population... The results are appropriate to support the discussion. Data Tables used are clear. The discussion is clear, streamlined, neat, and well developed Results are clearly used in the discussion and are sufficient to support the discussion. Discussion is adequate, however, suggestions are made. Furthermore, it is validated with relevant citations. Suggested proofreading and editing [see attached Corrected Manuscript] Conclusion are adequate What are the implications of this work?? Are there any limitations encountered, discuss!!! <b>REVIEW CAREFULLY THE WRITE-UP AND NUMBERING OF THE REFERENCES FOR CONSISTENCY, REMOVING REDUNDANCY, COMPLETENESS, AND TO MATCH THE JOURNAL'S REQUIREMENTS.</b> Proofreading and editing are needed [see all suggestions in the attached Manuscript]</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hussin Jose Hejase</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</b>