

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_106645
Title of the Manuscript:	SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC SPACE: FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF MIGRANT WORKERS IN THE INFORMAL SECTOR IN HANOI
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p><i>The manuscript is good and important for the scientific community esp. on the studies of discrimination and urbanization.</i></p> <p><i>The title is suitable for the concepts considered in the study.</i></p> <p><i>The abstract needs a little intro to the study (1 sentence) as to its significance.</i></p> <p><i>Subsections and structure is appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>The methods and discussions are scientifically sound.</i></p> <p><i>References are sufficient and relatively on-date.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><i>Yes, but a grammarian or technician might help to bring some terms closer to non technical readers.</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><i>I recommend putting the source or the reason for the statements chosen in the questionnaire.</i></p> <p><i>In the introduction, I suggest that social discrimination as concept and essence be discussed more.</i></p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfie Maria Custodio
Department, University & Country	Notre Dame of Dadiangas University, Philippines