

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_96883</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Experience of child drivers of the blind : Cases observed in the streets of the city of Kisangani in DR Congo</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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 REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The public health problem/policy neglected issue intended to be addressed is scientifically important. However, it is poorly presented/contextualized.</p> <p>Title should reflect exploitation/deprivation of children (human) rights in this 'income generating' activity.</p> <p>All subsections are unscientific and poorly presented. This makes the manuscript sound an "arm-chair thinking" product than a research study. Let authors demonstrate mastery of qualitative methods and manuscript/report writing.</p> <p>I <b>STRONGLY</b> recommend the author(s) follow journal-specific manuscript writing guidelines. Re-write the entire work scientifically and re-submit for re-review. I shall be happy to re-review this manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Manuscript editing <b>STRONGLY</b> recommended.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<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>Switbert R. Kamazima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania</b>