

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_106445
Title of the Manuscript:	LIFE AFTER IMPRISONMENT: EXPLORING THE REPERCUSSIONS OF JAIL TIME ON EX-CONVICTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article covered an important topic; that of the wellbeing and personal/social lives of formerly incarcerated/ prisoned individuals. The reportage of the participants' views/experiences have been comprehensively presented and the overall value/scope of the study findings is high. • The major le down of the manuscript was the writing style. The narrative was not at all smooth and was riddled with errors. In many instances, the ideas within paragraphs were not easily understandable due to the nature of writing. One major issue was the tense mismatch, as it switched back and forth between present and past tenses. It is best to maintain a past or past perfect tense throughout the manuscript and use present tense for quotes from the transcripts. • Compared to the second half of the article, the Introduction was rather weak. It did not adequately contextualize the research problem at hand. The flow to Methods chapter is rather abrupt. The section can be improved with distinct parts for Rationale/Significance, Description of present study, etc. • Since the article has elaborately covered the various issues faced by ex-convicts, there needs to be a more prominent section towards the end to highlight how the findings from the study can help improve the situation. It is not enough to merely report on the issue. The article has to be set up in a way that is directly connected to ground reality and solution of problems. • Comments related to the points on the left <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community; it covers an important topic which implicates the wellbeing of a distinct group of individuals. 2. The title of the article is suitable and apt. One suggestion would be to add a small part of the study setting/sample so that it is obvious right away. 3. The article needs to be reworked for better flow. It shouldn't be merely the repetitions of content from the main article. The Abstract has to be written separately and should not simply be the listing of the main points/themes. In that regard, the abstract can be improved. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate and follows a logical order. The sections follow the scientific method well and the distribution of content across various headings and paragraphs has been done well. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. For the research study conducted, most of the process follows the scientific method as per the details given; and the same has been reported scientifically in the manuscript as well. 6. The references are diverse and comprehensive. Most of the in text citations have been given properly. There are some issues in the bibliography list. One single formatting style needs to be followed in compiling the reference list. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were a lot of issues related to English language usage in the manuscript. There were errors in singular/plural use, punctuation, spellings, sentence structure, etc. Many times, sentences were so nested that ideas did not come through. There were also a lot of incomplete sentences and other errors that have been pointed out in the manuscript itself. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is quite lengthy at over 9000 words which is above the average. It is up to the editor's discretion to consider the manuscript as per the guidelines of the journal for word length. <p>The manuscript has scientific value and a major revision is required for it to be considered for publication. The results section has been done well but other sections need to be upgraded. Also, a thorough editing and proofreading by an English language expert is needed for the manuscript to have any chance for publication</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:	Prakat Karki
Department, University & Country	CHRIST, University, India