

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_98251
Title of the Manuscript:	BEHIND THE UNIFORM: POLICE VIOLENCE AND ABUSE BEFORE ENDSARS PROTESTS IN NIGERIA (1999-2020)
Type of the Article	Library research

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, it is important Yes, the title is appropriate The abstract is comprehensive however, by adding more detail on inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of documents to review as well as the search engines used. The subsection are good, but they could also be improved by including a section labelled Literature Review. In addition, the study could also be improved if there was a subsection labelled Research Questions: Research questions provide guidance for the direction of study and ensures that the goals are achieved or not. Yes, it is scientifically correct.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is good	
Optional/General comments	Good research work well supported with relevant current references.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Constance Chifamba
Department, University & Country	Solusi University, Zimbabwe