

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_128351
Title of the Manuscript:	Age Assessment of Asylum seekers: Legal Issues Referring to Personal Data Protection
Type of the 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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript tackles a highly relevant issue by addressing the legal and ethical challenges of age assessment for unaccompanied minors in the context of EU data protection policies. Its focus on the tension between protecting sensitive personal data and ensuring the best interest of the child is significant for policymakers and researchers. The proposed centralized database system offers a potentially impactful solution to harmonize procedures across EU member states. While the topic is important, the manuscript requires substantial improvements to meet academic standards and ensure its contribution to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is descriptive but could be refined for clarity and focus. Suggested alternative: "Legal and Ethical Challenges in Age Assessment of Asylum Seekers: Implications for Data Protection in the EU."	
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.	The abstract effectively outlines the main objectives, context, and recommendations of the manuscript. However, it could benefit from more specific details regarding the methodology (e.g., the tools or approaches used to derive the recommendations). Additionally, A brief mention of ethical challenges upfront would make the abstract more comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	While the manuscript aligns with established frameworks like GDPR and international conventions, it lacks empirical validation and a clear methodological framework. The heavy reliance on theoretical discussion limits its scientific rigor. Incorporating case studies or data-driven evidence would significantly improve its scientific accuracy and credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a substantial number of references; however, many are authored by Basdekidou, V., and Styliadou, A., raising concerns about diversity and balance. To strengthen the manuscript, additional references should be included, particularly from recent studies (2022–2024) addressing biometric data in asylum processes, GDPR compliance, and case law. Expanding the reference base would provide a broader perspective and improve credibility.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication but includes overly complex sentences and repetitive phrasing. Simplifying the structure and avoiding redundancies would improve readability. Additionally, consolidating the numerous footnotes into an abbreviations section at the beginning or end would enhance the article's overall presentation and flow.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses an important and sensitive topic, but it does not currently meet the structural and methodological standards of an academic journal article. The lack of a dedicated methodology section, empirical evidence, and a balanced reference list are notable weaknesses. Furthermore, excessive use of footnotes detracts from readability. Substantial revisions are needed to elevate the manuscript to the expected academic quality.</p> <p>Overall Evaluation</p> <p>The manuscript addresses an important and timely topic related to the age assessment of asylum seekers and the intersection of data protection laws with ethical considerations. While the subject is of high relevance, the manuscript lacks the rigor and structure expected of a high-quality academic journal article. Below, I provide a detailed evaluation of each section, along with specific recommendations for improvement.</p> <p>1. Introduction and Purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths: The introduction provides a solid contextualization of the legal issues surrounding data protection and the challenges in age assessment for unaccompanied minors. It effectively highlights the role of GDPR and EU migration policies. • Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The purpose of the article could be more explicitly stated, particularly at the end of the introduction. A clearer research question or objective would provide focus. ○ The practical relevance of the issue should be elaborated upon to underscore the urgency and importance of the proposed solutions. <p>2. Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths: The manuscript mentions the use of interviews and references to international studies as part of its methodological approach. • Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The manuscript lacks a dedicated methodology section. This omission makes it difficult to evaluate the robustness of the research. If the paper aims to be a review article, the methodology for selecting and analyzing the literature should be explicitly outlined. ○ Details such as the number of interviews conducted, criteria for expert selection, and the framework for evaluating recommendations are absent and should be included. ○ The lack of empirical data weakens the credibility of the claims. If the article is meant to propose a framework, the rationale and methodology behind it must be thoroughly described. <p>3. Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths: The manuscript critically examines the tension between protecting sensitive personal data and ensuring the best interests of the child, offering a theoretical framework for balancing these priorities. • Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The discussion is largely theoretical, with minimal empirical support. Incorporating case studies, examples, or comparative analyses of EU member states would enhance its depth. ○ Some claims are overly generalized and lack evidence. Specific examples, such as documented cases of ethical or legal challenges in age assessment, would provide stronger support for the arguments. ○ The proposed centralized database is presented as a solution, but potential risks, 	

Review Form 3

	<p>such as data breaches or misuse, are not adequately addressed.</p> <p>4. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths: The conclusion reinforces the need for a unified data system to improve the age assessment process for asylum seekers. • Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Avoid speculative or overly optimistic statements (e.g., “This innovation will solve all dilemmas”). Instead, focus on potential contributions while acknowledging limitations. ○ Consider adding a section on future research directions or policy implications. <p>Major Revisions Required: The manuscript should be substantially revised to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a clear methodology section, specifying the research design and analytical framework. 2. Include empirical data or case studies to support claims. 3. Diversify references to include more recent and varied sources. 4. Simplify the language and consolidate definitions into a single section to improve readability. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>While the manuscript addresses a critical topic, its current form does not meet the expectations of a scholarly article due to weak methodology, lack of empirical support, and over-reliance on a limited set of authors for references. With significant revisions, the paper has the potential to contribute meaningfully to the discourse on migration and data protection</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Razvan Carciumaru
Department, University & Country	University of Oradea, Romania