

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125631
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Youth Unemployment: A Holistic Analysis of its Underlying Causes
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The abstract and research design do not mention about the techniques adopted for the study. I am still really confused whether you have collected data from students. If yes this study has no validity. Ensure consistent formatting with the journal's guidelines, especially for referencing, figure placement and captions. You need to build a logical connection between the concepts	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Factors Influencing Unemployment among Tertiary Educated Youth	
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.	Needs refinements	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To some extend	
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.	While you present statistical evidence, there's room to further discuss what these results mean in the context of your theoretical framework and research questions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Not adequate	
Minor REVISION comments	Needs to improve	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Needs a clarity on the method section	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Addikarige Nalinda Nuwan
Department, University & Country	Colombo