

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123154
Title of the Manuscript:	Conceptualizing Migration: A Comprehensive Review of Its Causes and the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Migration Patterns
Type of the Article	There is no scientific research in the manuscript but a position paper on COVID-19 and migration in 2020

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	One, the paper is not necessarily been disliked by me but not measuring up to scientific research standard but a mere report. Two, the paper lacked all necessary ingredients of research work Finally, even as a position paper, the author did not structure the content accordingly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title has been worked on and a suggested was made in the comment. However, there is a disconnect between the title and the body of the manuscript, thus the suggested title: CONCEPTUALIZING CAUSES AND IMPACT OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON MIGRATION PATTERN IN INDIA: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Not in agreement with the body of the work Yes, but only the fluidity and not the core work from the body of the work An abstract should have the following components in summary: 1. The premise and general objective of the study 2. The research design 3. The theoretical and or conceptual framework 4. Methodology: Sampling techniques of data selection and collection of data 5. Cogent results and findings 6. Conclusion and recommendations Most of the components are missing in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Generally, the subsections are not in tune with the title of the work	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The underlisted elements are the basic standard of carrying out research anywhere and if all these are missing, then such study is not scientific but mere reportage. 1. The premise and general objective of the study 2. The research design 3. The theoretical and or conceptual framework 4. Methodology: Sampling techniques of data selection and collection of data 5. Cogent results and findings 6. Conclusion and recommendations Therefore, the reviewed manuscript lacked most of the above components of research conduct and writing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Though sufficient but most the listed works in the references were not in the body of the work	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but needed some editorial touches.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs a definite direction and thorough restructuring, even as a position paper.	

Review Form 3

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:	Lewis, E. O. Abejide
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Lafia, Nigeria